DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 205 CS 200 689

AUTHOR	Marckwardt, Albert H.; And Others
TITLE	Standards and Attitudes, Working Party Paper No. 5; Response, Record of Group Discussion; Papers of Working Party V and Study Groups VIII-Language; Miscellaneous Paper: Social Class, Linguistic Codes and Grammatical Elements; And Final Statements.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y.; National Association for the Teaching of English (England).; National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
PUB DATE	Sep 66
NOTE	114p.; Working papers of the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching and Learning of English (Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, Aug. 20-Sept. 16, 1966); For related documents see CS 200 684-688 and CS 200 690-700
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *English Instruction; *Grammar; *Language Instruction; Language Standardization; Language Usage; *Linguistics; Social Dialects; *Standard Spoken Usage; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	*Dartmouth Seminar on the Teaching of English

ABSTRACT

The question of standards of language and attitudes toward language is discussed in this set of conference papers. In the initial paper, a short review of language teaching practices in the United States since 1900 is presented. At that time, both grammar texts and books on language written for the general public displayed a rigid and unyielding attitude toward grammar, while most philologists and linguists tried to demonstrate the concept that a single monolithic standard of good English was untenable in theory and not in accord with fact. It is this dichotomy and attempts to resolve it that provide the topics pursued in the subsequent papers: suggested definitions of linguistics; native speakers; standard English and the schools; standards and attitudes; explicit teaching of language concepts; implicit and explicit teaching of the English language; linguistics for the English teacher; social class, linguistic codes, and grammatical elements; and a statement on teaching language. (TO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 082205

WORKING PARTY PAPER NO. 5

Standards and Attitudes

by

Albert H. Marckwardt

From one point of view it might be said that a considerable amount of research over the past seventy-five years has been devoted to demonstrating that the concept of a single monolithic standard of Good English is untenable in theory and not in accord with fact. Carried on for the most part by philologists and linguists, these efforts have had, over the years, something of a dual impact upon the English-teaching profession, and this in turn has given rise to certain reactions on the part of the public. I think it reasonable to say that, in the United States at least, we have not yet reached a comfortable resolution of the problem of linguistic standards, largely because reactions to the conclusions of scholars have become so charged with emotion that rational and broadly informed discussion has at times become difficult. Consequently, there is still a polarization of position within the profession, even though the numbers of those maintaining one point of view as over against the other may have shifted somewhat during the past two or three decades. Certainly, in view of the purposes of this seminar, the question of standards of language and attitudes toward language must be faced with candor, with sympathy for all points of view, and with as broad a perspective as time and space will permit.

One of the components of such a perspective is an understanding of the context in which certain ideas about language and language usage have been presented. Since the research mentioned at the outset has been conducted

CS 200 689

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

chiefly during the present century, the year 1900 will serve as the initial point to be considered. It was a time when the total enrollment in all the colleges and universities in the United States amounted to very little more than 250,000 and constituted only 4 percent of the population with ages ranging from 18 to 21. There were 630,000 students in the secondary schools, both public and private, representing no more that 10 percent of those in the appropriate age group. In short, one youth out of ten was attending high school; one young person out of twenty-five was in college. Although among this restricted population there were undoubtedly some instances of the children of sharecroppers, factory workers, and recent immigrants pulling themselves up socially by their bootstraps, the vast majority of the students must have come from homes where Standard English was the normal vehicle of communication. The problem of superimposing the prestige dialect of the language upon that which represented the linguistic heritage of the lower middle or working class student was minor, if indeed it existed at all.

What, then, went on in the high school and college English classroom? Chiefly the reading and discussion of literature and the periodic writing of essays. The essays, moreover, were written according to models which made up the bulk of the textbooks of rhetoric at the time. Such popular texts as Genung's Practical Elements of Rhetoric, Hart's Manual of Composition and Rhetoric, and Hill's Beginnings of Rhetoric and Composition devoted relatively little space either to a formal presentation of grammar or to items of specific usage. These matters were the responsibility of

the elementary schools, which already included a very high percentage of the eligible school children of the country. In them the problem of native language instruction was necessarily quite different in character.

Remedial instruction in the native language was clearly an elementary school function. A knowledge of grammar, the ability to parse a sentence, and later to diagram it, were the means of achieving this aim. The preferred model for the common school grammar was Lindley Murray's Grammar of the English Language Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners, which went through some two hundred editions. It was written in 1795 and reflected the authoritarian tradition characteristic of the eighteenth century grammarians (as distinct from the rhetoricians) in England. Murray, trained as a lawyer and successful as a business man, had no philological preparation, nor did most of his competitors for the American elementary school textbook market. Consequently their books reflected nothing of the new perspectives in language study which were developing as the result of the work of such scholars as Rask in Denmark, Grimm in Germany, Furnivall, Trench, and Hartley Coleridge in England, and William Dwight Whitney in the United States. Even so, as H.A. Gleason has remarked, "The grammarians were probably...on the average more open-minded on the matter of grammar and usage than the general public, and in particular than the poorly trained teachers and school boards that chose the books."[1]

Books on language written for the general public in the United States were even more rigid and unyielding in their attitudes than the elementary school grammars, but like them were efforts of the untrained amateur. A.M. Tibbetts has reminded us that L.P. Meredith, the author of Every-Day Errors

of Speech held the degrees of M.D. and D.D.S. and was also the author of a possibly more helpful and authoritative treatise on The Teeth and How to Save Them.[2]

One of the most popular of the books for the layman was Words and Their Uses by Richard Grant White, which appeared in 1870. White, highly urbane and polished, was the author of musical criticism, studies on Shakespeare, and political satire. He has been described as snobbish, witty, influential, and often unsound. He seems to have been wholly without academic training in language, unless he derived something by osmosis as a consequence of his friendship with Francis James Child. Some idea of the temper of his linguistic judgments may be gained from his characterization of the word practicioner as abnormal and indefensible, and his condemnation of presidential, tangential, and exponential as "a trinity of monsters which, although they have not been lovely in their lives, should yet in their death not be divided." He carried on the tradition of certain of the eighteenth-century grammarians by recognizing a law higher than mere usage. His work found a ready market in post-Civil War America and remained in print until the 1930's.

Thus, at the turn of the century there was, in books intended for the lay public and for elementary school children, a continuation of the language attitudes and the rigid prescriptivism characteristic of the age of Samuel Johnson. This was not the case in the high schools and colleges, where the students represented only a minority of the population and were presumed to be linguistically competent. Here the focus was upon rhetoric

rather than grammar and usage, and the textbooks, following Campbell and Blair, enunciated the Horatian doctrine of use as the sole arbiter and norm of speech. In the past this distinction has too often gone unrecognized in the heated arguments over the merits of the prescriptive and descriptive approaches.

There is still a third force to be considered, the professional philologists, academically highly competent, who have developed year by year a substantial body of knowledge on the history and structure of English, as well as of the other modern languages. With them the doctrine of usage was not a hypothesis; it was a conclusion derived from their examination of the relevant facts about the development of Standard English. As early as 1879, Professor Thomas R. Lounsbury of Yale University had written in his History of the English Language:

> . . . the history of language when looked at from the purely grammatical point of view, is little less than the history of corruptions...But it is equally true that these grammatical changes, or corruptions...have had no injurious effects upon the development of language. It is at the present time a fashion to talk of our speech as being in some ways less pure than it was in the days of Alfred. But the test of any tongue is not the grammatical or linguistic resources it may be supposed to possess; it is the use which it makes of the resources which it does possess...for it is a lesson which many learn with difficulty, and some never learn at all, that purism is not purity.[3]

There is evidence to support the belief that linguistic purism was a matter of concern to the academic community at this time. At the 1899 meeting of the Modern Language Association, the presidential address, delivered by Professor H.C.A. von Jagemann, was entitled "Philology and Purism." He concerned himself with the dilemma of the linguistic scholar who, in his

function as scientist and historian, was bound to recognize the present and past force of usage in shaping the language, but who, in the role of grammarian or teacher, could not escape dealing with matters of propriety and correctness. Read in the light of the present day, the paper turns out to be a strange mixture of those beliefs about language and its development which are generally accepted as linguistically sound today, and of a series of value judgments and prescriptive attitudes which we should be quite as firmly disposed to question. Von Jagemann recognized the importance of the spoken language. He warned against over-rating the authority of the great writers of past generations--or even the present. He advised that, in instances of divided usage, the one most in keeping with the prevailing tendencies of the language was to be preferred. He realized that American English would inevitably have to develop its own distinctive forms and modes of expression. Two years later, Professor Edward S. Sheldon, in another presidential message to that organization, dealt with the same problem with a comparable clarity of historical and linguistic perspective and the same apprehensions as to the practical consequences. What is interesting in both instances, however, is the modernity of the general approach to language on the part of these academics, decades before such matters became an issue in connection with the teaching of English in the schools.

It is evident then that most of the elements which loom large in the present conflict over what constitutes an acceptable and a workable language program for the schools were already present in some measure in 1900. What has happened in the intervening years amounts chiefly to a further develop-

ment and refinement of the principles and attitudes which were even then widely held by those professionally engaged in the systematic study of language, a continued resistance to them and indeed a fear of their consequences on the part of those who had been nurtured on the ideas about language current at the lay or popular level, a breakdown of communication, a plethora of arguments at cross purposes, appealing to the emotions rather than reason, and above all, a significant change in the makeup of the school population.

By 1920 the enrollments of the secondary schools in the United States had quadrupled the figure for 1900, and by 1930 they were almost nine times greater, even though the total population had increased by less than two-thirds of its 1900 figure. In 1930 over 50 percent of the children in the age group from fourteen to seventeen were in the secondary schools, five times the percentage for 1900. More and more students were going on to college--possibly one in ten by 1930, as compared with one in twenty-five at the turn of the century. An inevitable consequence of this increase was a shift in responsibility for the establishment of what came to be called "the decencies," from the elementary to the secondary schools. No longer could the high school teacher depend upon the home environment to establish and reinforce competence in the use of Standard English. The high school classrooms now included children from both sides of the railroad tracks, and English teaching necessarily had to assume a remedial function. These changes were reflected in the colleges as well, especially those which, for one reason or another, were unable or unwilling to establish rigorous standards for admission.

In the course of time the textbooks of rhetoric, which had been the staple of the high school and college classroom, were replaced by handbooks of composition. Woolley first appeared on the scene in 1907; the Century in 1920. These reflected a shift in emphasis from rhetorical nicety to linguistic propriety, and they were soon accompanied by auxiliary workbooks which permitted but one correct response to any of the linguistic quandaries they propounded. Concurrently, the emerging philosophy of educational empiricism fortified by the results of some pedagogical research discredited the effectiveness of the teaching of grammar as a means of developing correct language habits in the young. What came to be called "functional grammar" replaced the earlier comprehensive treatment of the subject, shifting the focus of attention upon details rather than system. The net results of this shift of emphasis have been described by H.A. Gleason:

> Language is a system (or a complex of systems). Its grammar must be systematic to be meaningful. Bits and pieces cannot be taught or omitted at will simply becuase they are judged individually useful or not. As items are dropped the system falls apart.... The experience of the schools with "functional grammar" has confirmed that random teaching cannot work. The more grammar is cut, the less successful is the teaching of the remainder. The more disconnected the facts, the more difficult they are to teach. "Functional grammar" with its emphasis on errors is self-defeating. It is tantamount to the elimination of grammar--simply a longer, slower process to that end.[4]

Thus, in the course of twenty-five years, the changes in the school population had made it necessary for the secondary schools and even the colleges to assume a large share of responsibility for the development of native-language competence. The kinds of textbooks and the approach to grammar reflected the change. For a number of reasons teachers were not at all well prepared to cope with the new situation. For one thing, their

professional training included little or no work in the structure of history of the language. It was not until 1927 that the National Council of Teachers of English even appointed a committee to consider the matter,[5] and by that time the Modern Language Association had completely purified itself of all pedagogical concerns. In addition the teachers, as a rule, came from nonacademic, nonprofessional backgrounds. For them school teaching was a step upwards in the social scale. As H.L. Mencken trenchantly but unsympathetically described the situation in 1922:

> Thus the youth of civilized upbringing feels that it would be stooping a bit to take up the rattan. But the plow-hand obviously makes a step upward, and is hence eager for the black gown.... There was a time when the typical American professor came from a small area in New England, and even of a certain austere civilization. But today he comes from the region of silos, revivals, and saleratus. Behind him there is absolutely no tradition of aristocratic aloofness and urbanity.[6]

This was overstated, of course, but it does suggest that as far as any degree of sophistication about language was concerned, the teachers, by virtue of background, inadequacy of preparation, and the immediate task before them, were more likely to find satisfaction and a kindred spirit in Richard Grant White than in Thomas Lounsbury. It is largely this which has caused so much difficulty in arriving at some agreement upon linguistic standards and attitudes in the schools of the United States.

At the same time that these changes were taking place, scholars were accumulating more and more knowledge about the history of English. The Oxford English Dictionary was pressing toward completion. Publications of the Early English Text Society were appearing steadily, increasing the amount of primary material available to the scholar. Lounsbury's work on

the history of English was followed by the work of Emerson, Joseph Wright, and later, of Henry Cecil Wyld. Albert S. Cook of Yale was responsible for some two score linguistic dissertations. A new generation of competent American phoneticians were emerging. Abroad, such scholars as Henry Sweet and Otto Jespersen were experimenting with new concepts in English grammar. This exciting activity in the field of language study, of which only a very small part has been mentioned, resulted in a further refinement and extension of the body of linguistic concepts which had been generally accepted by scholars at the turn of the century. As this extension and complication went on, the gap between the linguistic scholars and the popular notions embodied in the school textbook widened. Despite the best efforts of such men as Charles C. Fries, Sterling A. Leonard, and their successors, the scholar's concept of the linguistic standard is not yet fully comprehended, and his general view of language, his attitude toward it, is still alien to many who deal on a practical level with language in the schools.

Misconceptions about the scholar's view of usage are a case in point, and it is not at all surprising that they should have arisen. In itself the Horatian dictum that "use is the sole arbiter and norm of speech" is not especially helpful. It neither identifies the user nor suggests a solution for situations where usage is not uniform. George Campbell's characterization, "national, reputable, and present," satisfactory on two counts perhaps, still begs the question as to what constitutes reputability. One answer to this came from Fitzedward Hall, the self-trained and highly capable antagonist of Richard Grant White and all that he stood for. His

characterization, "the usage of the best writers and speakers," still appears frequently in school textbooks.

To the inquisitive scholars this was not a wholly satisfactory definition. It presented at least two difficulties. What they realized and what the schoolmen, the classroom teachers, the school textbook writers so frequently overlooked was the extent to which the usage of the best writers could and did vary. Lounsbury had made this point as early as 1904 in The Standard of Pronunciation in English when he wrote that, "Pronunciation must and will vary widely among persons of equal intelligence and cultivation,"[7] and he said virtually the same thing about grammar three years later in The Standard of Usage in English. In 1917, J. Lesslie Hall in his English Usage gleefully amassed and cited hundreds of instances of the employment of questioned or disputed usages from the works of standard authors. The preface of the second (1934) edition of Webster's New International Dictionary cited statements from six reputable authorities on the English language, all questioning the feasibility and the existance of a single, infallible, and permanent standard.[8]

The other question which presented itself was whether the usage of men of letters had in fact constituted the basis of Standard English as it had developed in the course of its history. A detailed examination of the emergence of and changes in standard language, not only English but others as well, lent support to the suspicion that cause and effect had been mistaken for each other. The studies of Morsbach, Flasdieck, and others led to the conclusion that fourteenth-century London English had formed the

basis of the standard language because London was the political, economic, social, and cultural center of the country, and that subsequent changes in the standard reflected such factors as population shifts and changes in the power structure. Chaucer, it was pointed out, wrote in London English becuase it was the standard, as did his contemporaries Gower and Wycliffe, who had not been born in the London area. This gave rise to a new kind of definition of the standard language, based upon social utility rather than literary tradition.

This new emphasis found expression in the mid-twenties in statements such as that by George Philip Krapp, to the effect that "A sufficient definition of the term standard will perhaps be found in the statement that speech is standard when it passes current in actual use among persons who must be accounted among the conservers and representatives of the approved social traditions in a community."[9] Two years later, Charles C. Fries commented in much the same vein: "As a practical program for the schools in their teaching, we have suggested a limiting of their consideration to the particular usage of those who are carrying on the affairs of the English-speaking people."[10]

However soundly based and logically justified these new concepts of the linguistic standard may have been, they provided cold comfort for the English teacher in an American classroom. In England one could at least assume, as Nancy Mitford (or really Alan S.C. Ross) did as late as 1956, that "it is solely by its language that the upper class is clearly marked off from the others." But there were too many American communities where

those who carried on the affairs on the local level were uncomfortably reminiscent of the devastating portraits by Sinclair Lewis in Main Street and Babbitt. Was this the kind of language to which they were to commit themselves? Krapp's statement that "the best national speech for a democracy is that which enables it to be most fully self-expressive" caused them to wonder if this might be the language of an Alfred H. Smith, or later, that of a Dwight Eisenhower. For them, a standard based upon social utility did not provide the values they felt they needed. Nor has this issue been completely resolved even today, although the presentation of usage in school texts is more realistic than it used to be.

Beginning in the late 1920's, linguistic scholarship turned its attention, at least in part, from the past to the present state of the language. A number of surveys of usage were undertaken, beginning with the study by S.A. Leonard, which was to culminate in the monograph Current English Usage in 1932. A decade later Charles C. Fries's American English Grammar made its contribution to the technique of the linguistic survey by using such objective, nonlinguistic data as education and occupation to classify the informants, thus avoiding the pitfall of circularity in classifying them on the basis of the language they employed. Specific items of usage were reported in countless articles in the learned journals. Ultimately, in the 1950's, the Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage by Bergen and Cornelia Evans, and Margaret Bryant's Current American Usage, provided reasonably reliable syntheses of the research on usage which had been carried on during the preceding two decades. The same kind of infor-

mation has been available in both the second and third editions of Webster's New International Dictionary.

Not everyone has been happy with the result. The most vocal dissent, however, has come from those members of college and university English departments whose principal concern is instruction in composition and literature, rather than from secondary school teachers. One frequent charge is that the evidence of current usage has been doctored, or at least that it has not been properly evaluated. This is implicit in a title such as "Dr. Kinsey and Professor Fries" (by John C. Sherwood),[11] and explicit in Sheridan Baker's statement that "the linguists have long wanted to see ain't grow respectable, to show the schoolmarm a thing or two, to champion the native language of 'the people,' and to supply an awkward gap in the paradigm of isn't."[12]

The traditionalist--and I use the term here without pejorative overtones--is not likely to be impressed when he learns that Addison, Steele, Defoe, Richardson, Coleridge, Carlyle, and Thackeray, not to mention another half dozen authors of the first rank, employed different than some 15 percent of the time. To him this merely serves to prove that Coleridge and Thackeray as well as Homer can nod; he is by no means persuaded that nodding should be condoned. And admittedly some of the articles on usage, particularly in the thirties, did convey the feeling that their authors were having an inordinate amount of fun kicking over ashcans. William R. Bowden's statement that the ordinary English teacher is a humanist by inclination and training is very much to the point here. "This

does not mean," he goes on to say, "that his attitude is antiscientific, but it is antibehaviorist. He is committed to a faith in man's moral, political, and social autonomy; and his subject matter includes not only what is but what he thinks ought to be."[13]

Can there be a resolution of these conflicting points of view? I believe there can, but there must also be something of an enlarging of the mind on both sides. First of all, the reports of the surveys must be read by the traditionalists more carefully than they have been in the past, and all of the pertinent evidence must be examined. In the logomachia over the third edition of Webster, Dr. Grove and his associates were criticized time after time for dictionary entries which merely repeated what was already in the second. Readers must learn to look behind the reported conclusions to the nature of the evidence. I know of few teachers, for example, who ever consult the tabulated summary sheets of the Leonard study, Current English Usage, yet they are very often germane and can throw considerable light on the brief summaries in the body of the report.

Those who have conducted usage studies have been especially culpable on two scores. They have far too often contented themselves merely with a nose count, a quantitative measurement given in the simplest terms. Until very recently, for example, accounts of the split infinitive were limited to demonstrating the age of the construction and enumerating the authors who had employed it. There was little or no attempt to distinguish the situations where a split infinitive avoided ambiguity from those in which it did not. In fact, I have not yet seen a full-scale treatment of all the syntactic patterns which the construction assumes. Until this is

done, the language analyst has not rendered all the assistance of which he is capable. The same might be said of the indefinite pronouns with respect to their agreement with verbs and pronoun antecedents.

A second shortcoming in many of the usage studies is their failure to report the attitude toward various types of constructions as well as the incidence of their use. The feeling about ain't is just as much a part of the linguistic record as is the fact that certain persons of culture, chiefly of the older generation--and I have encountered some--use it unabashedly in the first person negative interrogative. This kind of attitude study has two uses. It will identify certain shibboleths that the teacher of composition will balk at, no matter what the record of usage is. If attitude is broadened to include blockages or structural taboos, we may arrive at a better understanding of certain developments in the language. I think it reasonable to suppose that the reluctance of many Americans to employ mayn't and oughtn't accounts in part for the frequent substitution of can for may on the one hand, and the employment of hadn't ought on the other.

Improvement in the technique for reporting usage, important as this may be, is but a fraction of the problem. There are certain wholly defensible concepts of language, widely held by philologists and linguists for decades, which could be of positive, though perhaps indirect, assistance to the classroom teacher. Unfortunately these have not always been clearly explained, and in the heat of recent controversy have ofter come under attack.

Foremost among these is the relationship between spoken and written English. "I simply reassert a belief that has prevailed for centuries--until the new linguists came along about 30 years ago," writes Sheridan Baker, "when I say that the written language is more valuable than the spoken. Our books hold man's intellect and spirit more durably than stone, as Shakespeare and many others have observed. The written language is the best we can do. Its durability, precision, beauty, and downright necessity are so obvious that most laymen are dumbfounded when they hear the linguist chanting 'spoken language is the language'."[14] Much of this is true; more of it is beside the point. Most of it arises from misunderstanding.

Experience with attempting to describe the structure of literally hundreds of languages has taught the linguist to look at the spoken language for what it may reveal of the essential organization and structure. Some details of the structure of English are totally concealed in the written language: the variation in the pronunciation of the definite article, for example, whereas the identical pattern in the indefinite article is fully revealed. Stress as a determinant of part-of-speech function, as in <u>ó</u>bject (noun) as opposed to <u>o</u>bj<u>é</u>ct (verb) is not shown at all. The phonetic patterning of the regular noun plural and genitive singular inflection is suggested only in part by the spelling. Admittedly, these are not matters of grave concern to the teacher whose job it is to get his students to write acceptable compositions, but they are basic to the essential structure of the language, and this does fall within the proper purview of the grammarian.

As far as the novelty of the idea is concerned, Henry Sweet wrote in the Preface of his New English Grammar, "It is now generally recognized, except in hopelessly obscurantist circles, that phonology is the foundation of all linguistic study, whether practical or scientific." This was seventy-five years ago, and juding from the context, the idea was not new in his time.

Where the linguists are patently open to criticism is in their failure to provide contrastive studies of the structure of spoken and written English, particularly with respect to syntax. In addition to just the words, inflections, and patterns of arrangement, speech does make use of the additional resources of stress, intonation, and pause--features which are reflectedin the writing system rather clumsily at best. Moreover the speaker can and does shift structure as he goes along, or, if he wishes, he can break off and start over again. To compensate for the loss of these resources, the written language must necessarily be organized with a greater regard for logic. Modifying elements must be adjacent to their headwords; antecedent relationships must avoid ambiguity. What has not been studied sufficiently is the employment of structures in written English which occur rarely or not at all, or under quite different circumstances, in the spoken language. A perceptive treatment of such matters would be a help in the teaching of composition and might conceivably provide a useful tool for stylistic analysis.

No linguist competently versed in the history of English would question the assertion that Shakespeare and the Authorized Version of the Bible

have influenced the speech and writing of millions during the last three centuries. But the same linguist would also be likely to remember H.C. Wyld's careful demonstration of the extent to which the easy and cultivated prose of such seventeenth-century writers as Suckling, Cowley, and Dryden derived from the speech of the period, to say nothing of Wyld's conclusion that "the style of literary prose is alive and expressive chiefly in so far as it is rooted in that of colloquial utterance."[15] To suppose that the relationship of the spoken and written language from period to period has been anything but reciprocal would seem to be the height of naivete.

Wyld was here using the term colloquial in its technical and etymological sense. That it has come to mean something quite different is traceable in part to the classroom attitude which viewed the spoken language as a corrupted and imprecise form of written English. That this has happened is understandable. The composition teacher's primary concern has been with written English. The recent recognition in the United States that it is the business of the schools to prepare the students in oral English as well has been viewed with suspicion as an entering wedge for teachers and departments of speech, considered by the English-teaching fraternity as somehow belonging to a lower and less respectable academic order. Consequently, many English teachers have accepted and acted upon the dubious assumption that instruction in careful writing would carry over into the student's spoken language. This has had the inevitable and unhappy result that for millions of boys and girls, schoolroom English is something quite apart from the way in which they normally communicate.

Here the classroom teachers should have been alert to the fundamental distinction made by John Kenyon in 1948 between functional varieties (formal and informal) and levels of usage (standard and substandard) in the language.[16] This would have saved us from some of the worst of the confusion. We would have been better off still had we recognized, as J.R. Firth and more recently Martin Joos have done, that a scale of styles exists in all our use in English, and that each of the various styles displays characteristic features of diction and structure. I find it difficult to believe that a recognition of these complexities of linguistic behavior, if they are systematically arrived at and soundly reported, must necessarily lead to a relativism which implicitly denies all values. I readily concede that teachers have not been prepared to think along these lines, but this should not bar improvement in the future.

Certainly one of the problems facing the linguist is to furnish a convincing demonstration that his contribution to the teaching of the native language can be something other than negative. On the surface he has often seemed to substitute a permissive and relativistic attitude for the old certainties and verities. This has come about partly because he has tried to replace folklore with fact, and at times the factual record differs materially from what we have thought it to be. He has also, as in the distinction between level and functional variety, introduced subtlety into an area which once seemed simple; and most of us prefer simple to subtle answers--except in our own specialties.

Part of the difficulty, I am convinced, has arisen from the misinterpretation of statements made by linguists in connection with the entire

spectrum of human communication. Some of these have been read as if they applied specifically and only to those segments of the language with which the schools are concerned. The last of the five basic concepts of language behavior set forth in the NCTE publication The English Language Arts (1952) is a case in point. It reads, "All usage is relative." On the surface this seems to be a total abandonment of excellence, of even the concept of a standard. But what does the linguist mean when he speaks of relativity in this connection?

To me it is quite evident that he is speaking in terms of the purpose of a message considered in the light of the total situation in which it is uttered. Here "total situation" would include such factors as the geographical area in which the language is used, the age, education, and social standing of speaker and hearer, the nature of the medium (speech or writing), the emotional tone, and any number of other matters. Considered in these terms, usage is relative. "A reel of cotton" may be an impeccable expression in Britain, but there is no point in my using the term at Bamberger's in Princeton! It simply will not produce the desired result, any more than if I were to tell one of my students to "revise" the third act of Othello. And relativity, so interpreted, applies as well to all the aspects of communication which have been mentioned. The language employed in addressing a public meeting differs from that used in the family circle at the breakfast table, or at least I hope it does.

Unfortunately relativism has been taken to mean that we have no grounds for preferring one usage to another. There are at least two which

no linguist would question. The first is the likelihood of its conveying the message and producing the desired effect in the person who is addressed--a functional, and, in some sense, a rhetorical consideration. The second is its conformity to the canons of acceptability in level, functional variety, and style of language appropriate to the particular situation. As far as the English classroom is concerned, this amounts principally to formal written English and to what Joos characterizes as the consultative style in the spoken language.[17] These canons of acceptability are matters of linguistic fact and attitude. They can be and have been collected and codified.

When I try to justify a preference for one form over another on any other basis, I find myself in difficulties. Let us take the current tendency to substitute like for as as a subordinating conjunction as a case in point. A reasonably reliable record of usage informs me that it appears rarely or not at all in formal written English, but that its incidence in spoken English, especially of the informal variety, is much higher. I am also aware that many persons dislike the construction. I do not use it myself, either in speech or writing, and consequently would not defend it out of personal preference.

I know that historically it originated as an ellipsis of likeas, and that it appeared as early as 1530; it cannot therefore be dismissed as a recent solecism. I know also that in spoken English it often appears when a speaker changes constructions as he speaks. He begins to say, "John looks very much like his father," and he may end up with, "John

looks very much like his father did twenty years ago." In the light of cold reason I find it difficult to argue against it on the ground of change of function, first of all because English words have changed function frequently, some only after considerable resistance, and others without having caused a ripple. More specifically, how can I condemn the dual function of like as preposition and subordinating conjunction in the face of but, which performs as both preposition and coordinating conjunction? One was an adjective in origin, the other an adverb. With these a priori grounds failing me, I am thrown back to the record of its current usage and the attitude toward it.

How do I apply this in the classroom? Take an uncompromising stand against it, try to distinguish between use in speech and writing, ignore it, or try to assign a priority to it in a hierarchy of problems to be treated? My preference would be for the latter. Believing as I do that language habits can be changed only as a consequence of the expenditure of considerable time and effort, I must ask myself if my students would be better served if more attention were devoted to eliminating the multiple negative construction and the confusion between lie and lay, both of them more blatant instances of nonstandard language. And my answer, of course, would depend upon the extent to which they tend to make the latter errors. Viewed in one way, this could, I suppose, be called relativism. From another point of view it might be characterized as a judicious selection of alternatives or establishment of priorities.

Here, many of our answers will depend on the view that we take of the entire process of language learning. With respect to this, the linguist

has tended to focus upon the child's early years. A typical statement of the linguist's position is to be found in A Course in Modern Linguistics by Charles F. Hockett.

> By the age of four to six the normal child is a linguistic adult. He controls, with marginal exceptions if any, the phonemic system of his language; he handles effortlessly the grammatical core; he knows and uses the basic contentive vocabulary of the language. Of course there is a vast further vocabulary of contentives that he does not know, but this continues to some extent throughout his life. He may get tangled in trying to produce longer discourses, as in describing the activities of a morning at school, but clarity in extended exposition is a point on which older people also vary greatly.[18]

Again, as was the case with linguistic relativism, the linguist and the teacher in the English classroom are concerned with quite different aspects of language learning. There is little reason to question the accuracy of Hockett's statement, particularly if one places the proper interpretation upon grammatical core and does not read it to mean "the grammar of the standard language in complete detail." The recent research of Ruth Strickland and of Walter Loban supports Hockett's conclusion about early acquisition of the basic patterns. But "the further vocabulary of contentives" and "clarity in extended exposition," relegated to a subordinate position in what Hockett has to say, are the principal concerns of the composition teacher, and properly so. Moreover, as long as the grammatical core which the child has acquired is the core of Standard English, there is no problem, but if it is the core of a non-prestigious social or regional dialect, it is quite another matter.

Yet there is something of value in the linguist's view of language acquisition. It does alert the teacher to the strength and origin of the

language patterns he encounters in his students. It causes him to realize that more than a shotgun corrective technique will be required to change them. It should demonstrate to him that the concept of original sin, linguistically speaking, is untenable; children are not born with an innate tendency toward multiple negation or the lack of agreement between subject and verb. It should also suggest to him that he must find a way of teaching the standard forms without stigmatizing those which represent the folk speech of the community. To repeat a point made earlier, he will have to establish priorities in what he regards as acceptable in view of the possibility that he may encounter many more deviations from the standard than he will be able to correct. Yet, though tempered with a sense of flexibility, enlightened by an understanding of linguistic process, the concept of a standard must emerge. The linguist can do much in employing his knowledge of the language positively toward this end, but in order to achieve it, he must make himself understood, and the English-teaching profession must exert the necessary effort to understand what he says, and what he means when he says it.

Footnotes

1. H.A. Gleason, Linguistics and English Grammar (1965), p. 75.

2. A.M. Tibbetts, "The Real Issues in the Great Language Controversy," English Journal, 55 (January 1966), 28.

3. T.R. Lounsbury, History of the English Language (1879), pp. 351-53.

4. Gleason, Linguistics and English Grammar, p. 15.

5. The composition of the committee is of some historical interest. It consisted of Samuel Moore (chairman), W.F. Bryan, C.C. Fries, J.S. Kenyon, T.A. Knott, R.L. Ramsay, L.L. Rickwell, and J.F. Royster.

6. H.L. Mencken, Prejudices: Third Series (1922), p. 254.

7. T.R. Lounsbury, The Standard of Pronunciation in English (1904), p.212.

8. These included Daniel Jones, A. Lloyd James, Samuel Moore, George Philip Krapp, Edward S. Sheldon, and Otto Jesperseh.

9. G.P. Krapp, The English Language in America (1925), Vol. II, p.7.

10. C.C. Fries, The Teaching of English (19), Vol. II, p.7.

11. College English, 21 (February 1960), 275-80.

12. S. Baker, "The Art and Science of Letters: Webster's Third New International Dictionary," Papers of the Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters, 50 (1965), 532.

13. W.R. Bowden, ". . . The Way They Say It," College English 22 (April 1961), 483.

14. S. Baker, op. cit., pp. 528-29.

15. H.C. Wyld, A History of Modern Colloquial English (1920), p. 157.

16. J.S. Kenyon, "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English," College English 10 (October 1948) 31-26.

17. M. Joos, The Five Clocks (Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, Publication 22, 1962)

18. C.F. Hockett, A Course in Modern Linguistics (1953), p. 360.

Among the most helpful references in connection with this paper are the works of Gleason and Joos, cited above. In addition, the following are also pertinent:

Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens. The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching. London, 1964.

R.I. McDavid, Jr., (ed.). An Examination of the Attitudes of NCTE Toward Language. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965.

Roger W. Shuy, (ed.). Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965.

Response to Working Party Paper Five -
"Standards and Attitudes"

The first grammar book in English is Aelfin's written for quite young boys "in the hope that it may be some introduction to both Latin and English," and one that emphasizes a connection between grammar and speakiing correctly In the collogue he puts his case like this:

"We children beg thee, oh teacher, to teach us to speak because we are ignorant and speak incorrectly."

"What do you want to say?"

"What do we care what we say, provided it is correct speech and useful and not foolish or bad."

Some of our children today do not give this answer. They continue to speak as they were brought up. They maintain their membership of the speech fellowship to which they belong. I borrow the term "speech fellowship" from the British linguist Firth who in a paper called Personality and Language in Society, has this to say:

"Local dialects, regional dialects and occupational dialects, as well as the accents of the big English schools are speech fellowships. Within such speech fellowships a speaker is phonetically and verbally content because when he speaks to one of his fellows, he is also speaking to himself. That can be the most deeply satisfying form of self-expression. No wonder the true proletarian despises 'fancy talk' or any form of impersonation, except when it has entertainment value."

This, it is true to say, very many teachers do not understand. They are unaware of how their evaluation of speech habits devastates many of

their children. They are unaware that the chief factor in their evaluation is their own social conditioning. A whole range of aesthetic and moral value judgments are made by the social group to which they belong; and they are the superior group. Therefore they are in duty bound to save their children from original linguistic sin.

And the school books are a great help. They enable the teacher to inform the child:

that got is an ugly word

that nice is a lazy word

that we do not say "we was--"

that "I ain't got no money" means I have got some and that he must learn to say what he means.

He will also learn that verbs are doing words, although in his simple mind he may well have thought that all words do something. He will be told "English genders are extremely simple because all inanimate things are neuter...and in the next sentence "The moon is usually considered feminine": that words that are not there are understood to be there. Later he will be fortunate enough to discover that "the banality of a good many North American writers and speakers is in part due to their failure to understand that the genius of the English language does not lend itself to the generous use of superlative adjectives. The English prefer adverbs." (sic) and that "It is a good rule never to use a word of foreign derivation, especially Latin or Greek, when an Anglo-Saxon one will do." or "Latin borrowings tend to be too long and clumsy." And he will be not a little surprised to learn that

"People who live rough ugly lives have rough ugly speech." He will be shown "the position of the lips for making pure sounds."

And if after all this he is "phonetically and verbally content," then he is indeed fortunate. We know, however, that this is not so, that such teaching is grievous in its effect upon our children, that not only do many of our teachers themselves represent linguistic intolerance but they believe they have a duty to condemn the speech habits of the larger part of the community, for being different. I would like to quote from Professor Halliday here because he puts the case for the linguist so well:

"A speaker who is ashamed of his own language habits suffers a basic injury as a human being: to make anyone, especially a child, feel so ashamed is as indefensible as to make him ashamed of the colour of his skin."

Ed. A.B. Clegg, The Excitement of Writing

Introduction

A minority of pupils in the schools of this country are born into families whose members speak the normal language of educated society. If a child born into such a family "picks up" any phrase which does not conform to the convention, vigorous pressures are brought to bear to make him "drop it." Such a child will go to school knowing no other forms of language than those which his teachers themselves use and which his examiners demand of him.

There are, however, other children, possibly a majority in the country as a whole and certainly a majority in industrial areas, who have to learn this acceptable language at school but who, in some cases, may well face discouragement, or even derision, if they venture to use it at home.

For such children many social pressures inside the school and all outside it contrive to blunt the main tool of learning.

The following statement is by a boy in his first year in the sixth form of a South Yorkshire Grammar school, on the effect of social pressures on speech and language (Appendix, p. 136).

> The problem of speech facing a sixth former in a working class area is only a relatively minor one. It is a reflection of the much greater complexities he faces in having to live two lives, but his speech may be the most prominent manifestation of his embarrassment and discomfort. He is conscious always of being different. He has received an education that does not permit him to accept the values and general habits of his friends and relatives. He cannot yet, however, feel part of the sort of life he is being pushed into and feels conscious of his social background when in the company of well-spoken middle-class children. Of course, again, the main cause of this discomfort is lack of communication.

The selection of misconceptions and prejudices just presented is taken from materials available in our schools now. And every year adds similar material to the texts available to the teacher. Who writes them? And from what source do they take their material? To find the answer one must go back to a point Professor Marckwardt makes

Anyone could write a school grammar, for every native speaker of English is an expert where his language is concerned. In our country we have a long line of grammars for every occasion: In 1671 we have Thomas ... The Child's Delight, Together with an English Grammar; in 1752 we have Prittle Prattle, Or, a Familiar Discourse on the Persons I, Thou, He or She, We, Ye, or You and They, designed for the use and benefit of the people called Quakers; in 1770, An Easy Introduction to the English Grammar, composed by Thomas Joel for the convenience of children under seven years of age; and around 1798 Lady Eleanor Fenn's, The Mother's Grammar Being a Continuation of the Child's Grammar with Lessons for Passing.

In Hermes Philosophical Inquiry Concerning Universal Grammar, he writes, (Preface to the fourth edition): "The chief end, proposed by the Author of this Treatise in making it public, has been to excite his Readers to curiosity and inquiry; not to teach them himself by prolix and formal lectures (from the efficacy of which he has little expectation) but to induce them, if possible, to become Teachers to themselves, by an impartial use of their own understandings. He thinks nothing more absurd than the common notion of instruction, as if Science were to be poured into the Mind, like water into a cistern, that passively waits to receive all that comes."

Hermes had many fewer editions than Murray. And although there was wholesale canibalisation of grammars to enable the school-books to be written, and there still is, Harris appears to have been all too liberal to be attractive to the "gerund grinders." The scholars, the linguists were ignored because they gave no support to popular prejudices about language. Presently the amateurs carry the day; and they carry it away from any linguistic objectivity to the point at which prejudice and misrepresentation are offensively displayed. They frequently concern themselves with aspects of morphology and syntax in which children have effective control; they seldom do more than mention phonetics, phonology, intonation, stress, and rhythm, and it comes as a surprise to some students to discover that spoken language has this variety of patterning.

Phonetics was an emergent science in the late 19th century and its accurate and objective description of speech sounds enabled linguists to free themselves from the hold written language had on them. The amateur

grammarians, however, were eating dogs born before this historical moment and were in any case constitutionally unable to deal with such strong fare. So they do nothing to enable awareness of spoken language to be achieved.

They do not help the student to avoid ambiguities, unpremeditated tense shifts and changes of subject, nor dangling participles, nor how to extend and vary the sentence patterns he already possesses. To waste his time on what he has learned is bad enough but to confuse and bore him, and sap his confidence is worse. Such works give him no increase in power over his language and deliberately obstruct his insight.

Out of them, the amateurs, has come the belief that grammar can be equated with law, and that this law giving decides usage. In such a context mechanical correctness, the monolithic good English, good plain prose of the essay, need not be defined, they are prescribed. In many of our classrooms these so called grammars have degenerated into do's and dont's in the way teaching of literature degenerated into comprehension exercises; into inordinate concentration on linguistic table manners (we all spend more time eating than learning about how to eat); into misconceptions about spoken language - that it is less grammatical than the written and less regular in its patterns; into completing similes with no context; into looking up lists of words in a dictionary; into exercising mistakes in the use of apostrophe /and they ignore the nature of language varieties of dialect (which is language according to users) and of register (which is language according to use)/. And so on. It is not surprising that in some of our schools these books are not seriously considered any longer. Lower forms may have them to keep them quiet; but

even the examinations offer options or near options to the teacher, so that they can do more worthwhile things than learn to confuse "It's me, It is I," "between you and me, between you and I"; the shiboleths and the negative aspects of prescriptivism. So grammar is out, for both child and teacher, and a new generation of students has grown up with grammatical concepts they have arrived at on their own.

Martin Joos says somewhere that "normal fluent speech obeys about five or six grammatical rules per second: a critic can seldom detect, in a child's speech, more than one conflict with standard grammar per ten seconds on the average."

In school the teacher nags away at the problems of standards and usage, especially with the urban slum child. And he in self-protection may refuse to acknowledge the speech habits of his teacher as superior, any more than he may accept her middle class values. It is not just his English which is disparaged, but also his manners, his culture, his way of living in a fellowship. And he is in the right - his language mediates his needs, and does so effectively in his environment. Again, "There is the element of habit, custom, tradition, the element of the past, the element of innovation, of the moment, in which the future is being born. When you speak, you fuse these elements in verbal creation, the outcome of your language and your personality. What you say may be said to have style."

This is not about Charles Lamb, but about a very large number of our fellow men. Yet we know that many of the homes from which our children come equip them inadequately for what we would like to see them doing in school. Whether this is always wisely seen is another matter; and indeed one

would like to see the pre-eminence of writing over all other language activities be examined in the light of what our children need for their lives, as children and as adults to be. We judge them according to their non-conformity to a particular language variety and to quote Professor Halliday again: - "Such attitudes may be harmful; not because they represent personal preferences but because they have the apparent objectivity of social sanction."

This is not to say that teachers should do nothing to enable children to come to terms with the standard dialect. For the middle class child whose dialect has spoken and written forms, there is no problem. This tends to hide the problem of the non-standard speakers whose dialect has no written form. And everyone has, to some extent, to make the standard dialect his own in the written medium but also in the spoken medium as a listener to radio and T.V.

The issue is not a moral one; nor is it one of social status. As teachers we must find better reasons than these with which to motivate our children. We must be explicit and realistic about what is required, and imaginative about why it is required.

And the teacher must be able to look at the facts. Usage, like language, is dynamic. There is some disagreement about which are the disputed items, and they are, in any case, few enough in number not to need the expenditure of emotion at present devoted to them. But this is only part of the problem. Most of the time they are taught in a vacuum, and are not seen as related to decisions about the appropriate and effective use of language in a variety of contexts and situations.

The teacher must be aware, not only of the inventory of his own available choices, but of these of his student. He must be able to identify choices in his dialect that are different from those his student has, so that he can help the student to master the substituted items; and they must both be mindful of the situations in which these are appropriate.

The teacher will do this, one hopes, in a number of ways over a considerable period of time. And both may find it worthwhile. He will offer not just explanations and exhortations but example. And the learning will be achieved by using all the language skills, his own and that of many others, to assist the process; through speaking, writing, listening, and reading, through a wide, wide range of activities associated with these.

It is not enough as some teachers believe, to set up an exercise and think that the job is then done, discover that it fails, and then blame the student for this: a carry over from the way English mistakes are dealt with. There is the story of a teacher in England who was working with his class on the substitution of "put" for "putten." He had given them an exercise to do and was going round the class, when one boy called the teacher's attention to his neighbor by saying, "Look Sir, he's putten 'putten' and he should have putten 'put'."

Or there is the note left for the teacher, "I've writ, I have written a hundred times."

The moral is perhaps that to prescribe is no answer at all when what one is finally required to do is to produce.

Any activity that does not enable us to do the latter encourages misunderstanding about the nature of language, about the use we make of our native tongue, and about our appreciation of it.

Suggested Definition of Linguistics

Linguistics is the cumulative body of systematized knowledge and thinking about language.

Linguists engage in many different activities. Some of them are:

1) Developing, elaborating, and testing general theories of language.

2) Writing theoretical grammars of language they know well - usually as native speakers.

3) Collecting in the field or from native speaker informants samples of lesser known languages and studying their grammatical and phonological structure.

4) Studying existing writing systems and devising new ones for hitherto unwritten languages.

5) Studying the sounds of speech (phonetics) and analyzing the ways they are organized in specific languages (phonology).

6) Collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data revealing regional variety in language (dialectology).

7) Tracing the history of languages and language families, using written records and the methods of comparative philology and internal reconstruction.

8) Investigating, often with psychologists, psycholinguists, homologists, psychiatrists, and others, questions of language learning, bilingualism, linguistic pathology, etc.

9) Describing the social functions of language, and attitudes toward it, often in collaboration with sociologists, social psychologists, and sociolinguists.

10) Preparing dictionaries, descriptive and normative grammars, and other practical aids to language study and use.

11) Collaborating with teachers of both native and foreign languages in the preparation of teaching programs and materials.

12) Collaborating with specialists of various sorts on communication systems, machine translation projects, information retrieval programs, etc.

13) Working as or with literary scholars on questions of literary history, provenance, authorship, and style.

14) Developing theories of meaning and studying the relationship of language to other symbolical systems and to the outside world.

15) Writing nasty reviews of books written by other linguists.

Study Group I - Record of Group Discussion

The study group began with the questions, "What understanding of language does the child of five possess when he arrives at school?" "What must the teacher do to develop the child's language ability?"

It was stressed that growth of language takes place in the context of living. There was serious disagreement between psychologists and linguists on whether the growth of language depended more essentially on experience or more essentially on maturation of factors. Thus the question of whether the school and teacher provide experiences ... (?) is concerned with recognizing the stage of development and provide the appropriate material. (It is difficult to see why these two standpoints should be mutually exclusive.)

The child of five is capable of handling all the structures of the language. The aim is to add the stock of things he has to manipulate to increase his ability to handle them. Many children suffer from: (1) impoverish ment of vocabulary; and (2) inability to combine structures.

What could psycholinguists say to infant teacher?

It was felt that more research was needed:

1. In the 4-5 year old group in the home and street situation
   a. What expectations of speech parents had and what anxieties might arise from these?
2. What experiences give rise to verbal excellency?
3. Possible differences in function of language with which children arrive at school.

a. Cultural differences of what language is for.

4. Immediate affects on listener.

a. Adult explanations to child.

b. How much conversation between adults and children.

c. To what degree assumptions and expectations are made in home that schooling will make a difference.

We have to accept the fact of the need to preserve in the child his confidence in his social register; i.e., begin where the child is. It may, however, be necessary to recommend nursery school experience for all children to compensate for lack of opportunity to interact with (1) other children and other adults; and (2) to help him in establishing his older identity.

Language is the means by which we shape and order experience. It arises from context and situation. By changing the situation we change the utterance, change length of utterance not only at sentence level, and enrich the child's sense of what is appropriate. A child may be able to use the construction but we do not know whether he is able to use it or not until placed in situation. There is a distinction between what he does and what he is capable of doing.

Children learn through a totality of language experience that focuses attention (1) on situation in which language arises; and (2) relationships of the groups. (3) What sorts of social relationships?

Many children possess structure but not more mature uses. Without the opportunity to use language in different ways, they are not likely to flower.

Do Teachers Know Enough about the Functioning of Groups?

Study of group dynamics has been separated from language study; they need to be brought together.

1. Presence of teacher. What difference does it make even when teacher doesn't intervene?
2. Would like objective view of changes in language in different situations.
3. Need for work with 11-18 age group.
4. More work with joint design.

The Child's Experience in School in the Early Years

1. A permissive and democratic atmosphere to create a relationship based on trust and cooperation rather than one of passivity and obedience.
2. Acceptance of child to the dialect he uses so that he feels free to use his own voice, to build his self image and the image of others
3. Situations which allow for individual work and group work so that there is interaction between children and between children and adults.

Reading

Development of reading is a long continuing process.

Teaching children to read is only the beginning of the process.

Main effect of ... (?) - beginning to teach children to read earlier.

Beginning to ignore processes of psychological and linguistic development. The increasing emphasis on all children learning to read at the same

time and earlier is having the effect of reading from total context . . . (?) takes place.

Reading is more than skill - a thought process.

What is Reading Process?

1. Thinking is involved - not just making sounds.
2. Part of total language growth. Differences between spoken and written; interaction of the spoken and written language.
3. Analytic element has entered in.
4. Not simply perceptual skills: ignoring element of pattern making. Reconstructing language patterns.
5. Children's reading ability develops in variety of ways to uses they put it to.

Beginnings of reading has been cut off from whole language growth.

Talk is central. Why is it central? Reading . . . (?) process.

Of talk to himself. Unless child has generated a lot of talk - cannot do when confronted by written text.

Making it meaningful.

Being faithful to the non-verbal background. Relates to things and life - whole nature of child's experience of what is being offered.

Relation Between Spoken and Written

1. Range of things. Different ways of written down. More than recognize vocabulary.
2. Nature of material child is meeting.

3. His own dictation but also ideas of someone else (?)

4. The told story is the bridge between the spoken language and written.

Haven't had enough. Linguistic necessity as well as psychological necessity. Children's experience of books varies. Need for teacher to fill gap. Some children ready to read or having read books. Teaching varies needs more individualization.

Interrelationship between all the language activities.

Special move creates particular problems - lot time divorse from other activities.

Teacher conveys linguistic analysis. When look at notions language adult has inadequate assumptions. Model of language as sentence or not, correct or not, word or not, whole range of yes/no things.

Possible that reading stage is crucial in conveying this to young people. Excitement in language channelled into yes/no form. Things that come in words, sentences.

Not how lexical units function. Conveyed by deliberate attention to words. Saying right word or not, spell it correctly or not, teachers cannot dispense altogether with correctness corruption of vital interest of child in language. Natural interest of child not continuing.

Anything that teacher can do to a particular medium of language.

<u>In Reading</u>

First time directive attention to language can you direct attention for first time on right/wrong.

Inherent in partly in teacher's misconceptions. Relations between spoken to written. Need for teachers to explore this for themselves.

Different from exclusive attention to language as language. Authority of printed word to support teacher.

Use of child's own language for reading

How Long Operate in Child's Own Language?

Varies a great deal. When begin to help him to use standard dialect? Teaching second language.

How different is the dialect? May be able to write it in standard. Gap between dialect and standard - how wide? Where just pronunciation difference?

Careful how fast you move in this direction.

1. Acceptance of language they bring.
2. Teacher knows more about area.
3. Teacher needs to function in child's language. No reality for child unless teacher uses own dialect. Child cannot fail to notice that teacher operating in a total set of relationships.

   Teachers using own dialect not necessarily successful.

   Sliding scale - where . . . (?) for example,

   Reading is different step - ear language to eye language. Best it in child's own language.

   Special kind of step.

Large community not homogeneous - increased mobility. Implication that student should leave behind own accent. Can operate within acceptable variety of modes.

Nature of Reading Activity

Have we faced up to question of importation of middle class which has come from the written word.

Elaborated code - in class acquire from written language. Middle class child already acquainted with spoken prose.

Literature and effect on children's language memorized. Very subtle. Importation from song. Thousands of ways in which this is operated. Language of pop song highly sophisticated.

Analytic element becomes conscious for first time.

While still spelling phonemes cannot read with speed with which talks.

Tied up with some capacity for abstract thinking. Capacity to handle relationships when not there at stage when this kind of thinking not within their grasp. When may have legacy of failure.

Every reason why child shouldn't want to read. Intercept.

Adult approved. Teacher approved. Potentially powerful. Identify with adult wants to grow.

Laborious not always undesirable. Might be appeal. By of language on wards. Motive for readiness.

Pleasure in learning language. Two-year old on own in bed - flood of speech. Straight out of speech experiences of day.

Relation of Writing to Literature

Meet on Thursday

Reading brought in as integrated instruction

A heterogenous group of children from different cultural backgrounds so that the different groupings will influence each others language and thought.

Working Party V and Study Group VIII - LANGUAGE

Opening Statement

Working Party 5 and Study Group 8, which joined forces a week or more ago, have requested the present meeting because we were asked by a number of you to express ourselves -- to say something about the contribution the Linguist has to make to the teaching of English. We are glad of the opportunity to submit a series of eight papers with a covering list of what seem to us the main issues deserving discussion. Our intention is only to furnish focus, and not at all to put out of consideration any germane question.

In preparing these statements we have been struck over and over again by the impossibility of separating the language part from the rest of the English program. Language is involved with everything that English teachers teach -- with the child's self-expression, with communication between him and his schoolmates, as well as the teacher, with most of the skills he learns, with all the other arts, with examinations -- everything. In the other working parties and study groups too, questions of language have repeatedly forced themselves to the center of discussion. It is no exaggeration to say that language is the single unifying element in all education. Once this is recognized, it follows that to get the truth about language, as nearly as possible, is of crucial importance. Insofar as language is misunderstood or falsely taught, or is used to the psychic, social, or intellectual detriment of the child, the English teacher is not doing his job, and everybody is the poorer.

As further preface to discussion we may do well to notice in paper 2 the last definition of a native speaker. This important individual, the

token of everyone on earth who speaks, is there described as someone "who is by nature curious" about his language. This is an important truth: man is a speaking animal, he enjoys the instrument of speech and is intrigued with it. Herein lies the initial opportunity of the teacher. The child's natural interest has only to be wisely utilized to bring his waking imagination and intelligence into play. Much bad teaching of the past, and unfortunately of the present, is due to failure here; instead of liberating the child as native speaker and writer of his own language, the schools have attempted to make him over according to some stultifying concept of "correctness." Paper 5, "Standards and Attitudes," especially shows the result of this misteaching. The ultimate effects have been sketched eloquently, and perhaps frighteningly, by Professor Barbara Strang in a note written for Study Group 4. A kind of self-spreading infection becomes current among the public, who do not even know that they are ill. Too many English teachers are indistinguishable from this public.

The teacher who has no training in English linguistics is almost certain to be carrying around and relaying old-fashioned and discredited notions, derived in bits and pieces held uncritically and unsystematically, but often expressed without doubt or hesitation. People who know nothing about chemistry or hermeneutics may be willing to admit their ignorance -- not so when it comes to language. There is no field in which people generalize with more confidence on less evidence than in this. It is abundantly clear that English teachers need retraining, especially in regard to language. The "minimum essentials" that might be required of one properly retrained are set out in paper 8, "Linguistics for the English Teacher." We emphasize too that what needs to be corrected is no mere matter of facts or information.

Even more it is the attitudes of teachers that need to be reformed; Papers 3 and 5 especially touch on this.

The question on which our group finds least agreement -- in fact, a sharp difference of opinion -- is whether, in teaching children the so-called "productive" skills of reading and writing, it is necessary to teach language structure explicitly. One one side it is held that explicit teaching is unnecessary or even harmful; on the other, that without explicit teaching the child will not learn structure at all. Papers 6 (in two parts) and 7 are relevant here. This is certainly one area in which experimental evidence is needed. Another is the extent to which abstract knowledge is transferable to concrete problems in the use of English.

In papers 6b and 7 examples are offered of methods now used in some schools in the U.S. to arrive inductively at the child's internal knowledge of language structure. It should be noted that the aims of a curriculum set out in explicit terms are for the teachers, not the students. The teacher's knowledge about the language should be systematic; getting the same knowledge to a student may require a very different approach.

Probably the last thing we want to mention at this point is our very insistent feeling that no education can be adequate in which knowledge of our native language, knowledge of the mother tongue, is false, or shallow, or trivial. Language is too important to every individual, and to our civilization, for the teacher of English to betray it.

Native Speakers

The native speaker of English is an important person in this conference. We are looking inside him and outside him and we have gathered to consider how he is to be nurtured in his language until he is an adult.

Who is he? There are many confusions, some of which are sketched out below. I submit that until we clarify the nativeness of young native speakers, curriculum decisions will continue to rest on unexamined assumptions.

Statement No. 1 is an everyday operational definition; No. 2 is a sort of dictionary one; No. 3 is important in any study of standards; No. 4 expresses wonder at the robustness of native speakers; No. 5 is the only stupid statement; No. 6 explores the notion "knowledge of the language." No. 7 is so obvious that it is offered without further comment; the breadth of its implications is hinted at in other working papers.

* * * * * * *

Who is a native speaker of L?
(L is any common or garden language)

1. A native speaker of L is someone whose utterances are samples of L. This sort of native speaker is of no interest to educators.

2. A native speaker of L is someone who has no language acquired prior to L (etc., the "mother tongue" notion).

He has acquired L, so there is no obvious reason to set about teaching L to him.

3. A native speaker of L is someone who can understand all varieties of L. The limits of his comprehensibility define L (allowing leeway for acclimation).

Do the limits vary with age? If so how? Does acclimatization improve with practice? Research is needed before any idea of a receptive standard can be considered relevant.

4. A native speaker of L is someone who will accept uncritically any halfbaked statement about L, perform any ill-conceived exercise in L, think any random thought about L, without actually destroying his ability to communicate in L. He is insulated from his teachers.

What happens if he gets better statements and exercises, and has his thoughts discussed? What happens if he develops critical powers over L? We might give it a try.

5. A native speaker of L is someone in whom L is enshrined.

There is no such person, although many suffer custodian-delusion because of an inaccurate perception of linguistic change. This and many other wrong-headed notions cause an embarrassing consumer pressure that the teacher of L (after treatment) can resist and perhaps replace.

6. A native speaker of Lx is someone who learns Lx as his first language in an unselfconscious L-speaking environment. Lx is thus preschool language, which is not the same as L. During schooling Lx becomes L, and the situation is no different from teaching a foreign language L'.

Is this true? Are there any differences beyond age, attainment level, diet, etc? Does the same teaching to speakers of Lx and speakers of (L' + Lx) produce a different effect? Who are native writers of L?

7. A native speaker of L is someone who is by nature curious about L.

Standard English and the Schools

Standard English, like any form of living language, is not a fixed but a changing thing, hence it cannot be defined in any sharply limited or narrow way. Yet this does not mean that it is nebulous or indescribable: it differs quite specifically from other types of English, and has positive characteristics of its own.

Probably the foremost of these is the sphere of its use. Though it began fully five centuries ago in a limited geographic area and has since spread to every corner of the world, though its pronunciation was originally that of the same small area but now includes many local, regional, and national variants, as also variants in vocabulary and even syntax, it has always been that type of English used by educated people when carrying on their affairs publicly, in writing and in speech. It is therefore the language of law, learning, literature, government, religion, and the schools, but with at least two distinct registers, the formal and the informal, in which it varies according to time, place, purpose, and other circumstances.

It is essential for the teacher of English at any and every level to recognize several facts about Standard English. First, it is not monolithic: there is no single or only right variety; as an over-dialect it subsumes many types. Second, it never has been, is not, and cannot be fixed so long as it is alive; any skillful user has the right to avail himself creatively of its capacity to grow. Third, though, owing to the sphere of its use, it necessarily has prestige, this fact does not render false or valueless all other dialects of varieties of English; these have their right to exist and are frequently a means of revitalizing the Standard form.

A true understanding of the nature of Standard English should entail for the teacher certain attitudes toward the language. He should realize that, if the child brings a non-standard speech from home and community, this is not to be rejected in favor of Standard. Rather, Standard should be aimed at as something to be added, so that ultimately, if the occasion arises for communication in a wider context, he will be able to switch to Standard to suit that occasion.

The teacher should recognize that the highest goal in speaking or writing language of whatever kind is not some sort of "correctness" but rather, effectiveness--effectiveness in getting the message in the most appropriate way to the intended audience. It is possible to speak and write badly, that is ineffectively, in any idiom; merely to use the Standard dialect is not enough to produce good speaking and writing. The emphasis thus should go always on effective communication. The common emphasis today on superficial "correctness," both inside and outside the schools, is utterly misplaced; it is probably the root of our deep dissatisfactions with the teaching of English.

To cure this the teacher must be retrained; present methods of training must themselves be revised; and one essential which we must insist on is a sound knowledge of the mother tongue, its nature both past and present, and the role it plays in verbal communication of every sort, both practical and artistic. To give the teacher of English, at any level, less than this, will be to compound our past mistakes with present stupidity to the further impoverishment of the future.

Standards and Attitudes

The case for allowing children to speak and write fluently and spontaneously is accepted by many teachers, and today many young children are encouraged to express and communicate their individual interests. At the same time they are often engaged in the reading of materials that are covertly prescriptive, banal, and unrelated to life and language. There is a clash of interest here that some children do not survive; but even when this is not so, there is evidence that teachers have too little awareness of all the child's needs.

Children collect, categorize, and systematise the mass of facts, feelings, and observations in their daily lives and they make a great variety of utterances which absorb the results of these processes. Some of all this effort is used in their writing, much more in their speaking and thinking. They are using language to mediate needs, and language events are the most significant in their lives. Not only do they use language creatively in all their living, but they work out a means of thinking about what they are doing, of communicating with themselves.

Here, as we have seen, teachers are less than helpful. The facts they present run counter to the observations they make; and when teachers do not know the facts, students are alone with the problem. A successful solution depends on the effectiveness of the strategies that the student has at his disposal. Thus we see the 12 year old backward reader writing the word "hedgehog" with a set of orthographic rules he misunderstood when he was five: in his writing system it becomes "egog." What his teachers have told him over a period of years has made no difference to the effectiveness of his strategies. No connection has been established between what he

understands and what he is told to understand; for his teachers see their task as telling him something and then asking questions or setting problems to elicit the answers they gave in the first place; not that of discovering what it is the child thinks, nor or how he is able to modify his thinking during the learning process; nor whether he can think at all about the learning process.

Here are a few examples of five year old children demonstrating this in interviews conducted by a psychologist.

Q: What are letters for?

A: You have to know them.

Q: What will you do with them?

A: Put them away--maybe keep them out all the time, maybe put them away.

Q: What is hard about your reading a book?

A_1: The bits you forget.

A_2: Milk.

Q: Why?

A: Because it's milk.

Q: Why is it hard?

A: Because it's M. We've not had it before.

Q: Is there anything funny about "have?"

A: It's got an "e" on the end. It should only have three words instead of four words being there. You go to sound it and you hardly know what to say. It's like a different word.

Q: What do you do when you see a word that you don't know?

A_1: You say one word and then the next.

Q: (pointing to "and") What is that word?

A: G-N-B . . .

Q: How do you learn new words?

A: You say M-A-T. Some people know them.

A_2: I copy them. (Then, speaking of the word "this") I don't really know, but I can copy it. (sound T-H-I-S) I don't know. I can't copy it.

A_3: I spell it. (sounds T-H-I-S, but cannot pronounce the word without help)

Q: Does spelling always help you?

A: No, not if I get T and H together.

And finally, an interview with Tommy:

T: I'll write all the letters (writes e,i,b,p,q).

I: Are these words?

T: No, not words. I'll start with "come."

I: Is "come" a word?

T: Yes (writes "og")

I: Is that a word?

T: No. I'll make it into a word. (Adds "y." Tries to sound "ogy.") It's not a word in my reading book but it's a word I know.

I: What are words made of?

T: Words . . . (doubtfully)

(later) I'll write some numbers and then some letters. (Writes the numerals 1 to 11).

(later, writing "Mitten") It's got to have a capital 'cos it's the beginning of a word.

I: All words?

T: Yes, except "milk."

But Andrew said something different:

A: You put capitals at the beginning of a word.

I: All words?

T: No, not all. They're for an adult's book.

I: More than a child's book?

A: Yes, I think so. Bigger people can read bigger words.

Thus the child speculates about what he is learning. Thus he communicates with himself--and not just about learning to read. One day, five or ten years on, he may still be writing "egog": his writing may be "directionless"; or in another twenty years he may be writing to the "Times" complaining of the corrupting influences at work in his mother tongue. And the day when he writes:

At the picnic
A butterfly
Settles on the cheese

comes and goes; when, in the words of Judith Wright, the Australian poet, "the timeless thing is seen and isolated in its brief timelessness."

The crystals of copper sulphate are as beautiful as jewels - only they are not precious. They break and chip easily and dissolve in water, unfortunately.

And the day comes when the cat who sits on the mat demands:

After I had breakfast, I came to school and played in the playground.

and

20 cc. of distilled water were placed in the beaker.

There is no longer an audience. These latter children are writing for nobody, not even themselves. Once they had unselfconsciously experimented with many of the varieties within standard English. In the flow of their discourse they themselves were revealed. Infinite choice was available. But how can the teacher grade the growing imagination out of ten? Or the startling creativity? And the diversity of subject matter that natural curiosity uncovers?

It is not possible.

But spelling can be marked, and punctuation can be marked, and response to the set subject can be marked, and the grades can be worked out.

They have had their time for "play," and they are taken to see the Monolith who speaks in the dead language of speeches and who cuts them adrift from their intuitions. Now they are confronted with all the trivia within the standard language and are directed into menial levels of performance.

They need to be taught this. This is the language teachers complain that their children do not know. And where once one might have said that their mastery of the language increased as they used it in an environment of tolerance, now the picture is different. Now they get things right or wrong. They make mistakes and are judged by these more frequently than by their achievements. And a mistake, in terms laid down by the Monolith, is that which is unacceptable. The scale has two calibrations. At one end is CORRECT, and at the other, INCORRECT.

School is like a picture
Where everything is Black
Because it is work.

This slipped out in a child's notebook two months ago. He had a tolerant teacher who knew mistakes for what they are. He knew that all human learning is accompanied by imperfect performances. He was concerned with the achievement of his class, with their increasing mastery of the tasks they set themselves, and those they undertook in the context of the classroom. They had confidence. They worked with ease, authority, and pleasure. Nor were they uncritical each of his own work, having an awareness of the satisfaction achieved in one piece of work, the dissatisfaction of another piece which failed.

How might such a teacher interpret the term "mistake?" Perhaps he would do it like this if he thought about it at all:

1. A mistake is that which is communicated inadequately, ineffectively to the audience for whom it was intended.

2.- that which is accidental and unintentional, and part of the writer's occupational hazard. He needs a proofreader to help with the presentation of public utterances - even at five years of age.

3. - that which arises because of imperfect mastery of a learning process; this is not put right by marking him wrong, but only by giving him confidence to practice and assimilate from mature utterances produced around him. The meaning of what he speaks or writes may well not be impaired by such "mistakes."

4. - that which arises from misunderstanding or confusion, and from inadequate teaching.

Such a teacher will not pour Science "into the mind," as James Harris remarked, "like water into a cistern, that passively waits to receive all that

comes." And it is he who is likely to mediate between the children he teaches and the society that charges him to do so. But of many teachers this is not so. And few are wholly able to resist the social pressure inside and outside the school that "contrives to blunt the main tool of learning."

Explicit Teaching of Language Concepts

Certainly the teacher's concern with language and thought must include attitudes and appreciations as well as skills and powers. Delight in language and desire to use it are indispensable bases for instruction seeking to increase power and proficiency with language. It follows, then, that a wide variety of opportunities for using language must be devised by the teacher or must emerge spontaneously from the interests and life of the classroom. So far we are all in agreement.

But these opportunities for using language are not sufficient to provide for pupils optimum growth in their language powers. Attention to content and interest needs to be accompanied by a more systematic attention to how a thing is said or written. For economical learning, goals are needed and these goals should not be only in the mind of the teacher. The pupil, also, must become aware of targets. In the early years of schooling, these targets are usually relatively unconscious, but increasingly they should become explicit. Both pupils and teacher participate in identifying goals, some of which would otherwise be submerged in the complexity of language activities. Pupils need to gauge their success in language by reference to a goal, adapting their future response in the light of such evaluation. The process is one of establishing goals--goals that the child sets or accepts--then evaluation of success, and adaptation of subsequent behaviors. Selecting and learning the behaviors that lead to success with goals can be made more economical by teacher guidance, good models, and motivated practice. The teacher, of course, needs to know, both from research and from the accumulation of teachers' reported experiences, the pertinent evidence about maturation and child development in order to avoid

wasteful introduction of goals either much too early or much too late.

Some Examples

With pupils aged 9 or 10 the teacher shows a film about an organ grinder and his monkey; the pupils talk about the film; then the teacher writes the words of a sentence, each word on a separate placard. The sentence might be one like this:

However, in the foggy evenings, sometimes the monkey merely clung to the hand organ, shivering and whimpering while he ate his raisins.

The individual word placards are given to 22 pupils in the classroom. Those pupils who have just received placards go to the front of the room, stand in any random order, and display their cards. The remaining pupils help the teacher rearrange the placard holders to create a meaningful English sentence. The first concept to be noted: In our language the order of the words in a sentence is important for meaning.

Other arrangements are experimented with; the uses of pitch and stress are examined (juncture can be used later with two or more sentences). Pupils conclude that word arrangement in sentences is flexible, that different arrangements and variations in pitch and stress modify or mar meaning, sometimes subtly, sometimes remarkably. Further extensions and linguistic conclusions are possible. Followup can consist of stacks of small cards at the pupil's desk. He creates sentences, devises ways to alter them, copies his best sentences on paper, recites on what he has noticed about the ways language behaves.

In the first grade (age 6) the children begin a story told to the teacher; <u>The</u> <u>milkman</u> <u>came</u>. The teacher writes these four words on separate cards; one

child suspends them on a clothesline, using brightly colored clothes pins. Using a System (when? where? how? why?), the teacher helps them do "sentence-stretching" and their "word line" looks like this:

This morning the milkman came to my house walking quietly to bring us eggs and cream.

Purpose: the children learn--not yet at the conscious level--how modifying is done. At the conscious level they learn that telling more about something can be done in one surge of communication rather than a series of short surges and that to do so is often more interesting to others. Sister Mary Theodore Bolsen reports (The Instructor, March 1966) that by the second grade, pupils taught in this manner write longer and better-constructed sentences than those not so trained. As James Moffett points out (Drama: What is Happening), "a teacher listening to a student speak, or reading his theme, may never know whether he produces baby sentences because his perceptions and conceptions are crude or because he can't transform sentences. The best policy in any case is to enlarge the student's repertory of sentence structures."

Photocopies of W. Nelson Francis,"Writing and the Study of Grammar" STWE Review October, 1959, pp. 7-10, removed because of irreproducibility and copyright restrictions

Also removed because of irreproducibility and copyright restrictions:
David Abercrombie, "English Accents" in Speech Teacher (date of issue and pagination not given)
J. McH. Sinclair. "The Legs" A Linguistic Analysis of the Grammar of Graves' Poem.

The Teaching of English Language, Implicit and Explicit

We are agreed that the teacher needs to be equipped with sound knowledge about language. In his everyday dealings with his pupils' speech and writing and with the books they read he continually makes assumptions about the nature of language and the way it works. These assumptions influence his pupils' ways of thinking about language, and they ought therefore to be as truthful as he can make them.

Should any of this knowledge be taught, explicitly, to children, and if so at what stages?

The issues here need clarifying. In the U.K. the debate ranges mainly around grammar (morphology and syntax). In the past the main motive for explicit teaching of topics drawn from these levels of linguistic analysis to children between the ages of 8 to 15 has been a desire to alter or improve the structural patterns of the pupils' writing. A similar motivation can be detected in some U.S. programmes for introducing modern linguistics into the classroom; the Nebraska CDC's Teacher Packet "Language Explorations for Elementary Grades" suggests that the function of such teaching is to give them (children) some tools for expanding their repertory of linguistic resources or for using consciously and in composition the repertory they already command.

But at the age when they enter our schools, children have already formed most (if not all) of the intuitive generalizations about the structure of their mother tongue which enable them to use it productively. There is little room for expanding their repertory of linguistic resources at the structural level; and since they have already learned so much intuitively simply by using language

(as listener and speaker) in situational contexts, it seems probable they will learn the remainder just as efficiently by the same means as they would by deliberate and conscious instruction.

For the effective use of our native language depends, normally, on its patterns having become so fully internalized that we are unconscious of them. The idea that it is helpful, during the act of communication, for a writer or speaker to think consciously about the repertory of structures available to him is a dangerous fallacy. What the writer needs to attend to is the content of what he has to say, its purpose, its effect on his audience. This should lead us to place very low in our hierarchy of priorities the aim of making conscious the structural generalizations which children are already able to operate intuitively.

Moreover any systematic study of language at the grammatical levels calls for a degree of abstractness in one's thinking that children are seldom capable of attaining much before the age of 15 or 16. (Piagetian researches into concept formation are highly relevant here.)

Much more to the point, in the school situation, would be a study of language at the "context of situation" level. The basic procedure here would be to examine a variety of "texts" (both spoken and written) in relation to the contexts of situation in which they occur, observing the different functions which language can serve, and the features associated on the one hand with particular types of user (dialect) and on the other hand with particular kinds of use (register). Among the topics which would arise naturally in the course of this would be the relation of speech to writing, ideas about "correctness,"

the nature of a dictionary. One foreseeable difficulty is that study at this "context of situation" level necessarily involves reference to the more abstract levels of syntax, morphology, and phonology. It is not necessary however that the pupil should learn in detail the systems which are describable at these more abstract levels. "An analogy with the teaching of biology may have some point here. At one time the pupil learning biology was expected to commit to memory a great deal of information about, at one level, the structure and functioning of tissues or organs, at another level the type system. The more modern trend is to focus on the living organism in its environment, illuminating this study where necessary by reference to particular tissues or organs, or by a selective 'dipping-into' the type-system which enables the pupil to understand the system and to use it, without actually 'knowing' it in the older sense. It seems to me that similarly our linguistic studies (in the sixth form) should focus on language functioning in the human environment, illuminating this where necessary by a 'dipping-into' the more abstract levels of syntax, morphology and phonology, which would enable the student to understand the nature and interrelationship of these levels and to find his way around them, without actually 'knowing' the systems in detail." (The Disappearing Dais, Frank Whitehead, p. 229 footnote.)

It seems clear that there is a strong case for compulsory study of this kind within any English course which is a specialist option; in the U.K. it would thus become obligatory for sixth-formers who choose English as one of their specialisms.

Ought it not also to form part of the general education in English of all pupils who are capable of understanding it? The arguments for this would be:

(a) That such study corresponds more closely than any other to the kind of interest which adolescents already show in language.

(b) That it concentrates on those areas where conscious knowledge is most likely to be utilizable in the pupil's productive use of language.

My own hunch is that a majority of our pupils aged 15-16 or above could profit from work of this kind. It would be valuable to introduce development programmes (or "field trials") in both our countries to test this out in practice.

The Teaching of English Language, Implicit and Explicit

II

Linguists and teachers of English in general would probably agree with Frank Whitehead's opening statement concerning the importance of the teacher's knowledge about the language and how his knowledge, assumptions, and attitudes may "influence his pupils' ways of thinking about language." But a major difference arises between Mr. Whitehead's answer to his basic question and how some linguists and teachers, particularly many in the U.S., would answer the question: "Should any of this knowledge be taught, explicitly, to children, and if so at what stages?"

In the U.S., many linguists and teachers in elementary and secondary schools believe that what pupils learn about the nature and development of the English language, based upon the best available scholarship, has value in and of itself. To this end, these teachers--mainly those in junior and senior high schools--present explicitly and systematically appropriate elements of English sentences and longer discourses, usage, and semantics. They also take up matters of language incidentally, of course, when the subject is relevant to other aspects of their teaching. The pacing of this instruction depends largely upon local circumstances, particularly the teacher's judgment of what is suitable for a particular class or pupil.

One important purpose of helping a pupil to identify patterns, structure, and usage is to assist him in seeing a range of linguistic choices open to him, several of which may not have occurred to him as he was trying to express himself. Then he can also be helped to see the consequences of his choices. Some teachers

also hope that as they improve their teaching skills and materials, they may be able to help the pupil improve his ability to express himself more effectively. But this relationship between this kind of knowledge about language and ability to use the language has not yet been fully established by research.

The following general statements (taken from the State of Wisconsin guide to be published in 1967) are chosen to illustrate what kinds of attitudes toward language and knowledge about it might be included in an English language program in grades K-12.

"The English language program is designed with a twofold purpose:

To increase students' intellectual curiosity about language in general and the English language in particular and to give them some understanding of the structure and vocabulary of the English language and the way it functions in society. To achieve this purpose, the inductive, or discovery, approach is suggested throughout this program.

To help students use the English language more effectively."

"Though grammar plays the major role in the language curriculum, many other aspects of language are included: vocabulary, something of the history of the language, semantics, and usage; however, these subjects will not constitute major units."

"The study of grammar, which will focus upon the construction of sentences, will emphasize the systematic nature of the language...."

THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM

A. Sample exercises in seventh grade: learn to identify kernel sentence patterns and gain some skill in expanding each of them.

B. Sample practice exercises in eighth grade: pupils write their own sentences containing relative clauses and then practice applying the "deletion transformation" as a means of reducing predication.

C. Sample exercises in the ninth grade: pupils identify parts of speech by applying the four signals: word forms, word order, function words, and stress.

THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM

GENERAL OBJECTIVES

To a large degree the senior high language program should build upon concepts and skills learned and practiced in the elementary and junior high school grades. General objectives would include such matters as:

achieving greater sophistication in knowledge about linguistic structures and in using the language

increasing vocabulary

studying the effect of contexts upon the meanings of words

becoming aware of dialectal differences, both social and geographical, and the semantic and historical reasons behind these differences

studying the historical development of the English language in greater depth and in broader aspects.

During the senior high school years, pupils should gain increased understanding of the relationship between language and composition and language and the interpretation of literature.

Sample exercises: The teacher can extend pupils' understanding of the possibilities of using subordination by employing such transformational processes as

relative clauses, participial phrases, prepositional phrases, appositives, sentence modifiers, and absolute constructions. Pupils' awareness can be developed inductively by having them examine many excerpts taken from their themes and from literature.

Note: Such illustrations can give only a fragmentary, perhaps distorted, notion of what a systematic program for the teaching of language might include. Some of the university curriculum centers and an increasing number of school districts throughout the U.S. are developing organized programs for the teaching of language, particularly in junior and senior high schools. Scholars and teachers are collaborating on these projects. They do so because they believe that since language is an important part of human life, a study of it is culturally desirable.

Linguistics for the English Teacher

The minimum linguistic competence required of an English teacher must be sufficient knowledge--

(a) to assess continuously the role of direct teaching of linguistics in the classroom.

(b) to be able to express, directly or by implication, views about the nature of language and the structure of English which accord with the best scholarship available.

(c) to counterbalance the effects of his own learning of English.

(d) to guarantee the native speaker that the linguistic theory and system which will be used on or near him will be as self-consistent and comprehensive as possible.

Nothing short of a proper professional training in linguistics will suffice. No case is made here for specialised English language teachers. Every English teacher needs to learn about the present state of linguistics. Every teacher needs to be able to follow developments in theory and description throughout his teaching career.

Social Class, Linguistic Codes and Grammatical Elements*

In a previous paper (Bernstein, 1962) two general types of linguistic code, elaborated and restricted, were proposed. These codes were regarded as functions of different forms of social relationships. The codes were thought to entail qualitatively different verbal planning orientations which control different modes of self-regulation and levels of cognitive behavior. Social class differences in the use of these codes were expected. Speech samples were obtained and the hesitation phenomena analysed, from a discussion situation involving small groups of middle and working class subjects with varying I.Q. profiles. It was found that the middle-class groups used a shorter phrase length and a longer pause interval than the working-class group. These differences in the hesitation phenomena were sharper when working-class and middle-class groups, matched for intelligence on a group verbal and non-verbal test, were compared. It was considered that the members of the two class groups were oriented to qualitatively different levels of verbal planning which control lexicon and structural selections. The working-class groups were thought to be making selections from a lower level of the linguistic hierarchy; whilst the middle-class subjects irrespective of verbal I.Q. were oriented to making selections from a higher level of the hierarchy. This paper will report the analysis of the speech.

Description of the Experiment

Only a summary will be given here as the study has been described in detail in the previous report. Five sub-groups were selected with the characteristics shown in Table 1 from two parent samples. The members of the main

*The work reported in this paper was supported in part by a grant from the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

sample were drawn from a public school and a day release college. The pupils of the latter were all educated in secondary modern schools, none had achieved any formal examination certificate and all were employed as messenger boys. This group will be referred to as working-class and the first as middle-class. The mean age of the subjects was sixteen. A tape-recorded relatively undirected discussion on the topic of the abolition of capital punishment was taken with the five sub-groups.

Table 1

	GROUP	SUBJECTS	VERBAL I.Q.	S.D.	NON-VERBAL I.Q.	S.D.	AVERAGE AGE
Middle-class	1	5	125.0	1.81	123.8	2.75	16.2
	2	5	108.0	2.72	123.0	2.24	16.0
	3	5	105.0	2.14	126.0	0.00	15.6
Working-class	4	4	97.5	2.60	123.0	3.08	16.5
	5	5	100.0	4.60	100.6	3.20	16.2

Table 2

Utterances (Number and Type)

Group:	1	2	3	4	5	1+2	3+4	3+4+5
Long	21	19	22	12	24	40	34	58
Short	24	8	14	9	19	32	23	42
Total	45	27	36	21	43	72	57	100
Mean no. of words	48.8	52.9	68.8	49.6	39.8	50.3	61.8	52.3

Speech Sample

The speech sample consisted for each group of the 1800 words, approximately, which followed the first five minutes of the discussion. Long and short utter-

ances were distinguished according to whether the utterance was between ten and forty syllables or over forty syllables. The distribution is shown in Table 2. In order that close I.Q. comparisons could be made there was an interchange of one member between groups 1 and 2 and between groups 3 and 4. Groups 2 and 3 are matched for verbal and non-verbal I.Q. The membership of the original groups differed slightly from the membership shown in Table 1. This shift partly accounts for the differences in the total number of words analysed for each group. The lower number of words in group 2 is the result of shifting one original member who contributed 590 words and who took up much of the time of the discussion to group 1. A similar reason accounts for the low number of words in group 4.

Two members of the working-class sample, one from group 4 and one from group 5 were omitted from the analysis as neither contributed a long utterance and the total number of words for each was under 90 words. This results in the difference in the total number of words between groups 1 + 2 and groups 3 + 4 and reduces the aggregate number of words for groups 3, 4 and 5.

Table 3

GROUP	TOTAL NO. OF WORDS	NO. OF WORDS OMITTED	NO. OF WORDS ANALYSED	PERCENTAGE OMITTED
1(5)	2194	196	1998	8.9
2(5)	1429	139	1290	9.7
3(5)	2478	283	2195	11.4
4(3)	1042	84	958	8.1
5(4)	1709	123	1586	7.2
1+2(10)	3623	335	3288	9.3
3+4(8)	3520	367	3153	10.5
3+4+5(12)	5229	490	4739	9.4

Not all the words spoken were used for the analysis. All group comparisons except those for personal pronouns, are based upon a speech sample which excludes all words repeated, fragments (false starts and sequences which could be deleted without altering the meaning), sequences such as "I mean" and "I think" and terminal sequences such as "isn't it," "you know," "ain't it," "wouldn't he," etc. One personal pronoun count included the "I think" and the terminal sequences. The terminal sequences, for reasons which will be given later, are called sympathetic circularity sequences and are indicated by the abbreviation S.C. Table 3 contains a summary of the information relating to omission. It can be seen that the percentage of words removed from each group does not vary greatly. The general effect of the words and sequences excluded was to bring the social class speech samples closer together.

Statistical Analysis

The nature of the distributions indicated that non-parametric tests of significance were more appropriate as these tests do not require that the data be normally distributed and the variance be homogeneous. The Mann-Whitney u test of significance was used as it is considered the most powerful of the non-parametric tests and a most useful alternative to the parametric t test when the researcher wishes to avoid the t test's assumptions (Seigal, 1956). The grammatical elements were expressed as proportions of the appropriate populations. The distribution of the proportions for the various measures indicate that for the over-all sample the scores attained on the various measures are independent of the number of words.

Only when the comparison indicat d a signi ficant difference between the major class groupings (1 + 2 v. 3 + 4 + 5) were the sub-groups examined.

Intra-class comparisons were made to test the consistency of the inter-class differences. In the previous paper a number of inter-class comparisons were redundant in that given an over-all significance between the class groups only a limited inspection may be made of the sub-groups. Thus in this analysis groups 2 and 3 (the sub-groups matched for verbal and non-verbal I.Q. but differing in terms of social class) were compared; group 1 v. 2 and 4 v. 5 were compared, respectively, to test intra-class consistency. Tables of significance are not given (for reasons of space) where no difference exists between the major class comparisons and where the difference is so clear that statistical examination is unnecessary. One-tail tests were used as the direction of the differences was predicted on all tests.

Table 4

GROUP	I mean	I think	S.C.	I think and S.C.	I think and S.C. as percentage of words
1	10	21	4	25	1.25
2	5	22	4	26	1.82
3	26	11	35	48	2.10
4	2	3	15	18	1.88
5	11	3	17	20	1.26
1+2	15	43	8	51	1.55
3+4	28	14	50	64	2.03
3+4+5	39	17	67	84	1.77

RESULTS

No differences between the major class comparisons (1 + 2 v. 3 + 4 + 5) were found for the proportion of finite verbs, nouns, different nouns, prepositions, conjunctions and adverbs. No count was made fordifferent finite verbs as the writer found it difficult to decide the principle by which these verbs with their attendent stems could be classified.

I mean, I think, and S.C. sequences. Table 4.

I mean

This sequence was excluded from the analysis as it was considered a simple reinforcing unit of the previous or subsequent sequence and likely to be an idiosyncratic speech habit. The Table indicates the findings but of the 26 sequences for group 3, 22 were contributed by one subject; of the 11 sequences for group 5, 8 were contributed by one subject; of the 10 for group 1, 7 were contributed by one subject. The "I think" and S.C. sequences are not idiosyncratically distributed and their function is different.

I think

There is clear evidence that this sequence is used more frequently by the middle-class groups and especially by group 2.

S.C. Sequences

These sequences are used much more frequently by the working-class groups and within this group less frequently by group 5.

Table 5

SUBORDINATION

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	6	0.001
1 v. 2	5	5	8	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	1	0.008
4 v. 5	3	4	3	n.s.

"I think" plus S.C. sequences

If these sequences are added and the result expressed as a percentage of the number of words for each group then the difference between the major class groups is very small. Inspection of the table indicates that this results from

the low frequency of these combined sequences in group 1 and group 5.

Subordination. Table 5.

The method used to assess the use of subordination was pointed out to the writer in discussion with Dr. Frieda Goldman-Eisler. The first step was to isolate a unit which could readily be observed with a minimum of ambiguity in the two major speech samples. This was done by terming a proposition any sequence which contained a finite verb whether or not the subject was implicit or explicit. The implicit verb at the beginning of an utterance was not counted, e.g. "Not really...." When two finite verbs were associated with the same subject this counted as two propositions. If the number of such finite verbs is then divided into the total number of analysed words for each group a mean proposition length is obtained. There was no difference between the major class groups on this measure. The number of subordinations linking two finite verbs was counted and the proportion of subordinations to finite verbs was assessed for each subject. In this analysis the role of the "I think" and S.C. sequences becomes important. The latter would tend to decrease the proportion and the former to increase it. Inasmuch as these sequences are class patterned the results would be prejudiced. They were omitted in both the finite verb and subordination counts. The effect of this omission brought the two speech samples closer together.

Table 5 indicates that the difference in use of subordination when groups 1 + 2 is compared with groups 3 + 4 + 5, is significant at above the 0.001 level of confidence. The difference between groups 2 and 3 is significant at the 0.008 level of confidence. The intra-class differences are not significant.

No comparison was made of differences in sentence length as no reliable method for distinguishing the samples on this measure was available. A method appropriate for groups 1 and 2 would have been inappropriate for groups 3, 4 and 5. The method of double juncture was too sophisticated in terms of the skills of the research worker.

Table 6

COMPLEXITY OF VERBAL STEM

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	23	0.02
1 v. 2	5	5	12	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	3	0.028
4 v. 5	3	4	5	n.s.

Table 7

PASSIVE VOICE

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	21	0.02
1 v. 2	5	5	5	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	4	0.048
4 v. 5	3	4	4	n.s.

Complexity of the Verbal Stem. Table 6.

This count was based upon the number of units in the verbal stem excluding the adverbial negation. Verbal stems containing more than three units were counted for each subject and expressed as a proportion of the total number of finite verbs uttered (excluding the verbs in the "I think" and S.C. sequences). A verb plus an infinitive was counted as a complex verbal stem. The results indicate that groups 1 and 2 select more complex verbal stems than do groups

3, 4 and 5. The difference is significant beyond the 0.02 level of confidence. Group 2 selects more complex stems than does group 3 and the difference is significant at the 0.028 level of confidence. The intra-class differences are not significant.

Passive Voice. Table 7.

Major class differences in the proportion of passive verbs to total finite verbs was found and the difference is significant beyond the 0.02 level of confidence. The middle-class use a greater proportion of passive verbs and this holds when group 2 is compared with group 3 at the 0.048 level of confidence. The intra-class differences are not significant.

Uncommon Adverbs. Table 8.

An arbitrary classification was used to distinguish uncommon adverbs. Adverbs of degree and place, "just," "not," "yes," "no," "then," "how," "really," "when," "where," "why" were excluded from the total number of adverbs and the remainder, excluding repetitions, was expressed as a proportion of the total number of analysed words used by each subject. This remainder was termed "uncommon adverbs." A greater proportion of the adverbs of the middle-class are uncommon and the difference is significant beyond the 0.001 level of confidence. This difference, at the 0.004 level of confidence, holds when group 2 is compared with group 3. The intra-class differences are not significant.

Table 8

UNCOMMON ADVERBS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	2	0.001
1 v. 2	5	5	12	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	0	0.004
4 v. 5	3	4	3	n.s.

Table 9

TOTAL ADJECTIVES

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	16	0.01
1 v. 2	5	5	11	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	0	0.004
4 v. 5	3	4	3	n.s.

Total Adjectives. Table 9.

The proportion of all adjectives to total analysed words is greater for the middle-class group and the difference is significant beyond the 0.01 level of confidence. This difference holds at the 0.004 level of confidence when group 2 is compared with group 3. The intra-class differences are not significant.

Uncommon Adjectives. Table 10.

An arbitrary classification was again used to distinguish uncommon adjectives. Numerical and demonstrative adjectives and "other" and "another" were excluded from the total number of adjectives and the remainder excluding repetitions was expressed as a proportion of the total number of analysed words used by each subject. The middle-class groups use a higher proportion of uncommon adjectives to total analysed words than do the working-class groups and the difference is significant beyond the 0.001 level of confidence. This difference

holds at the 0 008 level of confidence when group 2 is compared with group 3. The intra-class differences are not significant.

Table 10

UNCOMMON ADJECTIVES

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	4	0.001
1 v. 2	5	5	11	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	1	0.008
4 v. 5	3	4	5	n.s.

Table 11

OF

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	19	0.01
1 v. 2	5	5	11	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	1	0.008
4 v. 5	3	4	0	0.028

Prepositions, Of. Table 11.

No difference was found, it will be remembered, in the proportion of prepositions to total analysed words. For reasons to be given in the discussion the use of "of" was of interest. The prepositions "of" and "in" combined account for over 34% of the total prepositions used. The relative use of "of" in relation to "in" and "into" was assessed by expressing the proportion of "of" (excluding "of" in "sort of") to the total of "of" and "in" and "into." The middle-class groups use a higher proportion of "of" than do the working-class groups and the difference is significant beyond the 0.01 level of confidence. The difference holds at the 0.008 level of confidence when group 2 is compared

with group 3. No difference is found when the two middle-class groups are compared but group 5 uses a higher proportion of this preposition than does group 4. The difference between these two groups is at the 0.028 level of confidence.

Uncommon Conjunctions. Table 12.

An arbitrary division was made. All conjunctions other than "and," "so," "or," "because," "also," "then," "like" were classified uncommon and the result was expressed as a proportion of total conjunctions. The middle-class groups use a higher proportion of uncommon conjunctions than do the working-class groups and the difference is significant beyond the 0.01 level of confidence. The difference holds at the 0.008 level of confidence when group 2 is compared with group 3. The intra-class differences are not significant. Much less faith is placed in this finding than in any of the others as the numbers are small and whether certain conjunctions are classified as types of adverbs will affect the result.

Table 12

UNCOMMON CONJUNCTIONS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	18	0.01
1 v. 2	5	5	12	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	1	0.008
4 v. 5	3	4	3	n.s.

Personal Pronouns

Two different assessments of the proportion of personal pronouns were made. The first included all personal pronouns and therefore those to be found in the "I think" and S.C. sequences. The second excluded those personal pronouns contained in the "I think," S.C. and direct speech sequences. Two different assessments were also made of the relative proportions of "I" and "you" combined with

"they." The first expressed these pronouns as proportions of total pronouns and the second as proportions of the total number of analysed words. The latter assessment was necessary to see whether those particular pronouns were used more frequently; the former merely establishes which of these pronouns within the personal pronoun group is selected more frequently.

All Personal Pronouns. Table 13.

The middle-class groups use a smaller proportion of all personal pronouns than do the working-class groups, Table 13(a). The difference is significant beyond the 0.05 level of confidence. The intra-class differences are not significant, neither is the difference in the proportions when group 2 is compared with group 3. The middle-class groups use a higher proportion of the pronoun "I" to total personal pronouns (Table 13(b)) and the difference is significant beyond the 0.001 level of confidence. This difference holds when group 2 is compared with group 3 at the 0.028 level of confidence. The intra-class differences are not significant. These differences hold when "I" is expressed as a proportion of the total number of words but at a lower level of significance (0.05) for the major class comparison (Table 13(c)).

When "you" and "they" are combined and expressed as a proportion of the total number of personal pronouns (Table 13(d)) it is found that the working-class group use a higher proportion of the combined pronouns. The difference is significant beyond the 0.01 level of confidence. No significant differences are found for the intra-class comparisons nor between groups 2 and 3. However, when "you" and "they" are expressed as a proportion of the total number of words it is found that the working-class groups use a higher proportion and this dif-

ference is now significant beyond the 0.001 level of confidence. The difference holds when group 2 is compared with group 3 and is significant beyond the 0.028 level of confidence. The intra-class differences are not significant (Table 13(e)).

Table 13

(a) ALL PERSONAL PRONOUNS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	29	0.05
1 v. 2	5	5	5	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	6	n.s.
4 v. 5	3	4	4	n.s.

(b) I: PERSONAL PRONOUNS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	13	0.001
1 v. 2	5	5	5	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	3	0.028
4 v. 5	3	4	5	n.s.

(c) I: WORDS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	30	0.05
1 v. 2	5	5	7	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	3	0.028
4 v. 5	3	4	5	n.s.

(d) YOU AND THEY: PERSONAL PRONOUNS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	23	0.01
1 v. 2	5	5	11	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	6	n.s.
4 v. 5	3	4	2	n.s.

(e) YOU AND THEY: WORDS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	14	0.001
1 v. 2	5	5	12	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	3	0.028
4 v. 5	3	4	4	n.s.

Selected Personal Pronouns (minus pronouns in I think, S.C. sequences, and Direct Speech Sequences). Table 14.

The middle-class groups use a smaller proportion of total selected pronouns than do the working-class groups (Table 14) and the difference is significant beyond the 0.05 level of confidence. No significant difference is found for the intra-class comparisons nor when group 2 is compared with group 3. The middle-class groups use a higher proportion of the pronoun "I" to total selected personal pronouns (Table 14(b)) and the difference is significant beyond the 0.05 level of confidence. The difference holds when group 2 is compared with group 3 at the 0.028 level of confidence. No significant difference is found for the intra-class comparisons.

No significant difference is found when "I" is expressed as a proportion of words.

When "you" and "they" are combined and expressed either as a proportion of selected personal pronouns or of words (Table 14(d) and (e)) the proportion of these combined pronouns is higher for the working-class group and the difference for both assessments is significant beyond the 0.01 level of confidence. In neither case are the intra-class differences significant nor when group 2 is compared with group 3.

The exclusion of personal pronouns in the above sequences brings the speech samples closer together. Direct speech sequences were excluded from the count

because their content tends to be concrete, e.g. "The judge says, 'I shall send you away for six months.'" It is thought that the proportion of selected personal pronouns to words gives a better indication of how concrete the speech samples were.

Personal Pronouns - Summary.

In both counts of total personal pronouns the combined middle-class groups use a smaller proportion. In both counts the middle-class groups more frequently select "I" among the personal pronouns but only in the case of all personal pronouns does this group use "I" more frequently. In both counts and for both words and personal pronouns the working-class groups use "you" and "they" more frequently. These groups both select and use these personal pronouns more often. The lack of significance in the case of "I" when expressed as a proportion of selected pronouns to words is the result of the exclusion of the "I think" sequences. The critical result is that the differences in the over-all use of personal pronouns and the selections made within them holds when the two speech samples are brought close together by excluding the "I think" and S.C. sequences. No over-all class differences were found for the remaining personal pronouns. The relatively low level of significance both for total personal pronoun counts and for the use of "I" must be taken to mean that these findings are only suggestive.

DISCUSSION

The results will be discussed in relation to the two general linguisitc codes mentioned at the beginning of this paper. For a more detailed account of the social origins and behavioural implications of these codes the reader is referred to previous papers (Bernstein, 1961a; 1961b; 1962).

Table 14

(a) SELECTED PERSONAL PRONOUNS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	33	0.05
1 v. 2	5	5	5	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	11	n.s.
4 v. 5	3	4	4	n.s.

(b) I: PERSONAL PRONOUNS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	31	0.05
1 v. 2	5	5	12	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	3	0.028
4 v. 5	3	4	4	n.s.

(c) I: WORDS

N O T S I G N I F I C A N T

(d) YOU AND THEY: PERSONAL PRONOUNS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	23	0.01
1 v. 2	5	5	11	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	6	n.s.
4 v. 5	3	4	2	n.s.

(e) YOU AND THEY: WORDS

GROUP	n	n	u	P
1+2 v. 3+4+5	10	12	19	0.01
1 v. 2	5	5	12	n.s.
2 v. 3	5	5	5	n.s.
4 v. 5	3	4	3	n.s.

The codes are defined in terms of the probability of predicting which structural elements will be selected for the organization of meaning. The structural elements are highly predictable in the case of a restricted code and much less so in the case of an elaborated code. It is considered that an

elaborated code facilitates the verbal elaboration of intent whilst a restricted code limits the verbal explication of intent. The codes themselves are thought to be functions of different forms of social relations or more generally qualities of different social structures. A restricted code is generated by a form of social relationship based upon a range of closely shared identifications self-consciously held by the members. An elaborated code is generated by a form of social relationship which does not necessarily presuppose such shared, self-consciously held identifications with the consequence that much less is taken for granted. The codes regulate the area of discretion available to a speaker and so differently constrain the verbal signalling of difference.

The community of like interests underlying a restricted code removes the need for intent to be verbally elaborated and made explicit. The effect of this on the speech is to simplify the structural alternatives used to organise meaning and restrict the range of lexicon choice. A restricted code can arise at any point in society where its conditions may be fulfilled but a special case of this code will be that in which the speaker is limited to this code. This is the situation of members of the lower working-class, including rural groups. An elaborated code is part of the life chance of members of the middle-class; a middle-class individual simply has access to the two codes, a lower working-class individual access to one.

It follows from this formulation that orientation towards the use of these codes is independent of measured intelligence and is a function of the form social relationships take.

The results of this study clearly indicate that the class groups are differently oriented in their structural selections and lexicon choices. Further-

more, this difference is relatively consistent within the social class sub-groups. Within the working-class sub-groups, (3, 4, and 5) the difference of over 20 non-verbal I.Q. points does not produce any major disturbances in the consistency of the results. Similarly the difference of 17 verbal I.Q. points between the two middle-class groups (1 and 2) does not affect the orientation of the speech as reflected in the measures used. This does not mean that within the middle-class groups there are no differences in content but that the low verbal middle-class group is at least oriented to making types of selection at both the lexicon and organisational level which are in the same direction as those made by the high verbal middle-class group. (1) It is very clear that group 2 and group 3 (the class groups matched for verbal and non-verbal intelligence) are oriented to different selection and organisation procedures.

It is thought that the constraints on selection procedures found in the working-class speech samples may well be found in speech samples of a restricted code independent of the class membership of the speakers. The data will now be discussed in more detail.

The restriction on the use of adjectives, uncommon adjectives, uncommon adverbs, the relative simplicity of the verbal form and the low proportion of subordinations supports the thesis that the working-class subjects relative to the middle-class do not explicate intent verbally and inasmuch as this is so the speech is relatively non-individuated. The difference in the proportion of selected personal pronouns to words suggests that the content of the speech is likely to be descriptive and narrative and this possibility is increased by the low proportion of subordinations.

---

(1) This sub-group used longer words as measured by syllable length (Bernstein, 1962).

The class differences in the relative preference for "I" or "you" and "they" is of interest. Even when the speech samples are brought close together (that is when the "I think" and S.C. sequences are omitted) the middle-class select "I" more frequently among the personal pronouns than do the working-class; whilst the working-class select "you" and "they" more frequently among personal pronouns and these pronouns are used more frequently in the speech. These relative preferences reach a higher level of significance when they are expressed as proportions of all personal pronouns and words.

The use of "they" is not simply the result of the tension between in-group and out-group. It is not the case that "they" is used solely to distinguish non-members of the group. Inasmuch as referents are not finely differentiated then the global term "they" will be adopted as a general label. The non-specifity implied by "they" is a function of the lack of differentiation and the subsequent concretising of experience which characterises a restricted code as a whole. On the one hand, too high a level of abstraction is used ("they") yet on the other, speakers are often involved in the consideration of a series of individual concrete cases. What appears to be lacking is the intervening series of successive levels of abstraction. The lack of specification also implies that there is possibly some implicit agreement about the referent such that the elaboration is redundant. In this sense "they" is based upon "we." How much is redundant will depend upon the community of interests generated by "we."

The use of "you" (second person plural) may also arise out of the concretising of experience. It offers a formal subject which facilitates a ready identification on the part of the listener. The content of the statement is presented in such a way that the listener can translate this in terms of his

experience. Contrary to expectation, "one" was not used by the middle-class groups. Even if "one" is used, it is often not the psychological equivalent of "you"; for "one" may involve a differentiation of own experience from that which is the subject of the discourse. This is not to say that "one" may not be reduced to "me," but "one" at least extends the invitation to an objective consideration.

The constraint on the use of "I" is not easy to understand nor is it easy to demonstrate what is thought to be understood. It may be that if an individual takes as his reference point rigid adherence to a wide range of closely shared identifications and expectations, the area of discretion available is reduced and the differentiation of self from act may be constrained. Looked at from another point of view the controls on behaviour would be mediated through a restricted self-editing process. If, on the other hand, the controls are mediated through a less constrained self-editing process the area of discretion available to the individual in particular areas is greater. It may well be that such different forms of mediation, in themselves functions of the form social relationships take, are responsible for the differential use of the self-reference pronoun. If this were to be the case then the relative infrequency of "I" would occur whenever the form of social relationship generated a restricted code. The degree of restriction of the code would affect the probability of the use of "I." If individuals are limited to a restricted code one of its general effects may be to reduce the differentiation of self.

The data indicated that although no difference was found in the proportion of prepositions to words the middle-class group selected a higher proportion of

the preposition "of" to "of" plus "in" and "into." These prepositions account for a much greater proportion of the total prepositions than do any other three. In earlier work it had been suggested that an elaborated code would be associated with greater selection of prepositions symbolising logical relationships than with those indicating spatial or temporal contiguity. "Of" has also an adjectival quality and it may be that the restraint on this form of qualification is also responsible for the relatively infrequent use of the preposition "of" in the working-class groups. There is a hint that this may be the case. With the working-class groups the average group (5) selected a higher proportion of this preposition and it is this group which uses a higher proportion of adjectives although the difference is not significant.

Of particular interest is the class distribution of the S.C. sequences. It is thought that these sequences will occur more frequently whenever a restricted code is used. The meanings signalled in this code tend to be implicit and so condensed, with the result that there is less redundancy. A greater strain is placed upon the listener which is relieved by the range of identification which the speakers share. The S.C. sequences may be transmitted as a response of the speaker to the condensation of his own meanings. The speaker requires assurance that the message has been received and the listener requires an opportunity to indicate the contrary. It is as if the speaker is saying "Check - are we together on this?" On the whole the speaker expects affirmation. At the same time, by inviting agreement, the S.C. sequences test the range of identifications which the speakers have in common. The agreement reinforces the form of the social relationship which lends its objective authority to the significance of what is said. This also acts to reduce any uncer-

tainty which the speaker may have had when the message was first planned. This uncertainty may not only arise out of the change in the level of coding. Inasmuch as a restricted code is generated by the sense of "we-ness" then at the point where a speaker is giving reasons or making suggestions the form of the social relationship undergoes a subtle change.

A shift from narrative or description to reflection - from the simple ordering of experiences to abstracting from experience - also may signal a shift from we-centred to individuated experience. If this is so, then this shift introduces a measure of social isolation for the speaker which differentiates the speaker from his group in a way similar to a figure-ground relation. In as much as the group is based upon a closely-shared self-consciously held identification the change in the role relationships of the members is clearly indicated. The unspoken affirmation which the S.C. signal may receive, reduces the sociological strain upon the speaker. In a discussion situation which invites the verbal signalling of individuated experience, the "we-ness" of the group is modified in direct relation to such individuated signalling. The S.C. sequences may then function as feelers towards a new equilibrium for the group; that is towards a new balance in the role relationship of the members. This analysis is wholly consistent with the use of these sequences as an idiosyncratic speech habit of an individual. The point here is that they are released relatively frequently by all individuals if they are contrained by a particular form of social relationship which generates a restricted linguistic code.

Thus groups 3, 4 and 5, the working-class groups, who it is considered are limited to a restricted code, will use such sequences frequently. The uncertainty of the appropriateness of the message, for these groups, in a discus-

sion situation will probably be relatively great. This will add to the sociological strain inherent in producing a verbally individuated message. As a consequence, the frequency of S.C. sequences may be expected to be great.

The middle-class groups are oriented to an elaborated code which is appropriated to a formal discussion situation. This code facilitates the verbal explication of meaning and so there is more redundancy. In a sense, any speaker is less dependent upon the listener because he has taken into account the requirements of the listener in the preparation of his speech. The form of the social relationship which generates this code is such that a range of discretion must be available to the members if it is to be produced at all. Further, the members' social history must have included practice and training for the role which such social relationships require. Role does not refer to the specific role within a discussion group but more generally to the particular role relationships consequent upon the use of an elaborated code. These role relationships receive less support from implicit identifications shared by the participators. The orientation of the individual is based upon the expectation of psychological difference, his own and others. Individuated speech presupposes a history of a particular role relationship if it is to be prepared and delivered appropriately. Inasmuch as difference is part of the expectation, there is less reliance or dependency on the listener; or rather this dependency is reduced by the explication of meaning. The dependency underpinning the use of a restricted code is upon the closely shared identifications which serve as a back-cloth to the speech. The dependency under-pinning the use of an elaborated code is upon the verbal explication of meaning. The sources of strain which inhere in these codes, and so in the social relationships which generate them, are different.

Thus the use of S.C. sequences in an elaborated code will tend to be relatively infrequent.

In the light of this argument, of what significance is the frequency of "I think" sequences which are associated, it is thought, with the use of an elaborated code and so differentiate groups 1 and 2 from groups 3, 4 and 5?

The preface "I think" is probably as much an indication of semantic uncertainty as the S.C. sequences are in a restricted code. The former sequence does not usually require affirmation; in fact such return signalling is often inappropriate. It invites a further "I think" on the part of the listener. The sequence signals difference and relates the sequence to the person. It symbolises the area of discretion which the form of the social relationship permits. It translates in palpable form the sociological relationship contraining the participators. The ego-centric basis of the interaction is raised like a flag. At the same time this sequence, just like the S.C. sequences, may indicate the strain in the social interaction but in this case the strain is taken wholly by the individual.

Table 4 indicates that group 2 used more "I think" sequences than group 1, the high verbal middle-class group. (2) In the previous report the analysis of hesitation phenomena indicated that group 2 relative to group 1 used a shorter phrase length and a slower rate of articulation. This was taken to mean that group 2 were in a situation of coding difficulty. If the S.C. and "I think" sequences are functional equivalents in different codes then the total number of such sequences might give an index of coding difficulty. Table 4 indicates

---

(2) The number of S.C. sequences produced are too small for comparison.

the percentage occurrence of this combination. Group 1, the high verbal middle-class group, and group 5, the average working-class group, have very much lower percentages. There is little objective data which can be used to support the hypothesis that these groups were under less coding difficulty. However, group 5 in relation to all the other sub-groups used a much shorter pause duration per word which suggests that the speech was well organised and of a high habit strength.

Finally, these sequences may set up different constraints on the flow of communication, particularly on its logical development and elaboration. Inasmuch as the S.C. sequences, which are generated basically by uncertainty, invite implicit affirmation of the previous sequence then they tend to close communication in a particular area rather than facilitate its development and elaboration. The sequences tend to act to maintain the reduction in redundancy and so the condensation of meaning. The "I think" sequence, on the other hand, allows the listener far more degrees of freedom and may be regarded as an invitation to the listener to develop the communication and so the logical development and exploration of a particular area. The content analysis of the speech samples may throw some light upon this function of the "I think" and S.C. sequences. These sequences then, in the light of the above argument, play an important role in maintaining the equilibrium which characterises the different codes.

If this analysis is appropriate then the role of "I think" and the S.C. sequences (where they are not idiosyncratic habits) can only be understood in terms of the two codes of which they are a part. As the codes are functions of different forms of social relationships or more generally, qualities of different social structures, then the function of these sequences must receive sociological

analysis. Different orienting media, different forms of dependency, different areas of discretion inhere in these codes and thus the sources of strain in the relationships are also different. Psychological factors will affect the frequency with which different individuals take up the options represented by the sequence. At this point it would be better to conceptualise these sequences as egocentric and sociocentric signals.

As language is a patterned activity, the consistency of the findings for the two codes is partly to be expected. To attempt to assess the relative contribution of the various measures to the stability of the code is beyond the scope of this report. It is thought that the best single indicator of the two codes is the proportion of subordinations to finite verbs and this measure is, of course, implied in the original definition of the codes.

It may seem that this discussion of the results is somewhat unbalanced in the sense that it has been almost limited to the personal pronouns and the egocentric and sociocentric sequences. This is because in previous papers attention has been given to the findings on the other measures. An attempt has been made to relate the results to conditions more general than social class. Class is a particular but not a necessary exemplar of the codes. The latter are more strictly functions of social hierarchy.

CONCLUSION

The findings clearly indicate that for this small sample of subjects speech orientation to the two codes and verbal planning processes which they entail are independent of measured intelligence indicated by the tests used. The mean difference of over 20 non-verbal I.Q. points between the working-class groups 3, 4, and 5 does not disturb the orientation of the speech. The mean

difference of 17 verbal I.Q. points between the middle-class groups 1 and 2 again does not disturb the orientation of the speech of these groups. This does not mean that the quality of the speech is necessarily the same but that the class groups differ in terms of the level of structure and lexicon from which selections are made.

The results fall into two main groups in terms of the direction of the differences found for the various measures. m after the finding on a particular measure indicates that the result holds only for the major class comparison (1+2 v. 3+4+5).

GROUP A

Middle-class groups used a high proportion of the following:

Subordinations

Complex verbal stems

Passive voice

Total adjectives

Uncommon adjectives

Uncommon adverbs

Uncommon conjunctions

Egocentric sequences

'of' as a proportion of the sum of the prepositions 'of,' 'in' and 'into.'

(This finding is not consistent within the working-class group.)

'I' as a proportion of all personal pronouns.

'I' as a proportion of total number of words.

'I' as a proportion of total selected pronouns.

Where the level of significance of the difference for the major class comparisons is0.05, the finding should be regarded only as suggestive. In the above group results this applies to 'I' as a proportion of total selected personal pronouns and 'I' as a proportion of words.

GROUP B

The working-class groups use a higher proportion of the following:

Total personal pronouns (m)

Total selected personal pronouns (m)

'You' and 'they' combined as a proportion of total personal pronouns (m).

'You' and 'they' combined (total personal pronouns) as a proportion of total number of words.

'You' and 'they' combined as a proportion of total selected personal pronouns (m).

'You' and 'they' combined (selected personal pronouns) as a proportion of total number of words (m).

Sociocentric sequences.

The significance of the difference for the above results is at the 0.05 level of confidence in the case of total personal and selected pronouns.

No significant differences were found for the proportion of finite verbs, nouns, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and the proportion of the selected personal pronoun "I" to number of words.

It should be remembered, when assessing the results that the working-class sample was reduced by two subjects as these subjects contributed too few words to justify analysis.

Although the findings for the class comparisons are not related to the number of words, the results must be placed in the perspective of a very small speech sample. The consistency of the findings for the two class groups suggests that if the speech samples were increased it would be a little unlikely for the working-class groups to change their level of verbal planning and maintain it. The topic of the discussion may also have affected some of the elements measured and the relationship with the researcher could have affected probably the quality and amount of speech. The topic may have had a different significance for the two class groups. The working-class may have tended to identify with the criminal and the middle-class with law and principles of justice. The point is not that such identifications may occur but their effect on speech. One can identify with the criminal but not necessarily be limited to speech with the characteristics associated with the present findings.

It will be remembered that the arrangement of the original groups was different from the arrangement for this analysis. In the case of groups 1 and 2 and groups 3 and 4 internal exchanges within the class groups were made in order to control more adequately for verbal I.Q. Whilst the scores the exchanged members received were appropriate to the groups to which they were attached, the possibility that the middle-class group of average verbal ability (group 2) may have been affected by the presence of the high verbal subject cannot be ruled out. On the other hand the original groups 3 and 4 contained the possibility of a similar disturbance, but perhaps more limited in its effect as the verbal I.Q. range was narrower. The important question is whether the groups were sufficiently stretched by the discussion to allow for the possibility of changes in the level of the speech. The researcher is confident that the

conditions for changes in the level existed in all groups. The measures used in this report are too insensitive to allow the measurement of variations within a given level. It is clear, however, that a longer speech sample, obtained from many more subjects under different conditions, including written work, is required.

With these reservations in mind, it is considered that the results of the analysis of the hesitation phenomena and of the simple grammatical analysis presented in this paper are supportive evidence for the two codes and their social class relationship.

REFERENCES

BERNSTEIN, B. (1962). Linguistic codes, hesitation phenomena and intelligence, Language and Speech, 5, 31.

BERNSTEIN, B. (1961a). Social class and linguistic development: a theory of social learning. In Education, Economy and Society, ed. A. H. Halsey, J. Floud and A. Anderson (New York), 288.

BERNSTEIN, B. (1961b). Social structure, language and learning. Educational Research, 3, 163.

SIEGEL, S. (1956). Non-Parametric Statistics (New York).

Q. 1

Statement on Teaching Language

According to one school of opinion, knowledge about the structure and functioning of language is best assessed on the basis of whether it contributes to the proficiency of students as users of language. That view is alluded to in the conference paper by Professor Marckwardt called "Language and Environment Considered in Relation to Knowledge and Proficiency." Professor Marckwardt writes that: "If it can be demonstrated that knowledge of the structure and functioning of language results in a more proficient use of it, there can be no question of the value of such knowledge." Teachers and scholars who are more or less of Professor Marckwardt's persuasion on this point tend to focus their thinking about the classroom uses of linguistic knowledge on questions about how to increase proficiency. Their assumption is that a working knowledge of certain rudimentary linguistic concepts - those for instance of intonation, word order, function words and the like - can be of advantage to students whose purpose is to improve themselves as writers and speakers. And again: members of this school of opinion believe that exercises of the sort found in the Wisconsin program, the Purdue project, or in the sentence-stretching example provided in Professor Loban's paper also work toward the development of the student's flexibility and agility and general command as a user of his native tongue.

There is, however, another opinion concerning linguistic knowledge and its place in the English classroom: a school which maintains that the usefulness or lack of it of this knowledge simply cannot be judged in the proficiency

context. Men of the latter persuasion ground their sense of the urgency of linguistic knowledge at every level of English teaching on the conviction that knowing little about language means in the end knowing little about man, about social organization, about culture itself. The linguistic knowledge they have in mind - awareness of what words are, awareness of the way in which men seek to lay orderly verbal systems over against the confusion within themselves and beyond themselves, awareness of the extraordinary degree to which the cohesion of public life and private thought is a creation of the word - may not help the student to write splendid compositions, but can help him perceive himself more clearly as a composer of his experience, a maker of order.

The members of this committee are convinced that the best claim for teaching . . . (?) by linguistic knowledge is one founded on the latter truth. We doubt that the case for the teaching of language structures at the elementary and secondary level is soundly based when it makes much of the argument that proficiency in language can thereby be increased; we doubt that exercises specifically addressed to the end of increasing proficiency are well-conceived. But we are certain that teaching which aims at leading students outward from their sense of language as an artifact, a giving, to a sense of themselves as organizers of experience in the act of speaking or writing - we are certain that this kind of teaching is an absolutely invaluable part of the life of the English classroom.

A Proposal for Research and Development Work in the U.S., U.K., and Canada in the Teaching and Learning of English in Unstreamed Schools which are Unaffected by External Tests or Examinations

At the beginning of our seminar there were, no doubt, those who hoped that there might by the end emerge a solid and agreed body of opinion about the teaching and learning of English; perhaps out of the tumult there might emerge someone to do for English what Dr. Zacharias has done for the early stages of physics.

As our last day draws near, it becomes clear that anything of the kind is unlikely. Not because of any irresponsibility or basic disagreements between us; on the contrary, though we do disagree at certain points, there has been a strong undertow of something like understanding about many essentials which has carried us farther than anyone could have expected when we began.

But no agreed solution is in sight, for two main reasons:

1) Thinking about aims and methods in English is still very fluid and moving fast; it has not yet come near the point at which a crystallizing out might be expected. If anything, our discussions will have the immediate effect of making current views more fluid, not less.

2) English can affect and is powerfully affected by a number of external factors, such as streaming or grouping, examinations; the pressure to win one of a restricted number of university

places or a place at a prestige university; the existing patterns of teacher training; and so on.

Reforms within English depend on reforms in many of those external factors. We certainly have much to find out, for example, about the implications of a "workshop" approach, and need to study the possibilities more closely. But we shall never achieve this, or combine freedom with imagination, or achieve the right kind of continuity in English studies (with responsible individual and group study beginning early on and developing throughout school), or give our students the confidence which they need, if we have to go to work in the context of the streamed school whose work lies under the shadow of selective examinations.

If we really mean business, should we not seek as a matter of urgency to carry out a major experiment over several years in one or more districts - e.g., perhaps one each in the U.S., U.K., and Canada - in which a group of school districts - using school buildings specifically designed for the purpose - would be given a mandate and every opportunity to experiment with new approaches to English of the kind we have in mind (and no doubt others) in concert with analogous approaches to other subjects. These schools would not introduce streaming or grouping: students entering them would not be allowed to enter for external examinations; special arrangements would need to be reached with these universities which took part in the experiment to admit students to the university on the basis of joint school-university consultation. Their progress would be carefully followed.

Such an experiment would require a good deal of support and finance. It would be necessary first to ensure adequate, though not untypically good, buildings and material provision, including books; the teacher-load would need to be kept down to a reasonable figure; a good deal of preparation in-service training, recording, and follow up would be essential. The result would give some idea of what might be expected of normal students under reasonable conditions; at the least this should help us to work for better conditions, but with the opportunities which economic development may bring sooner than we think; it may well be that before long, if we want the right things, we shall get them.

We believe that the one or more foundations might consider specific proposals emanating from this seminar. This proposal would take a good deal of working up into a concrete form, which cannot be done this week. But would the seminar recommend some such proposed experiment in principle and set up a sub-group to consider more detailed proposals?

XVI

Q.3

Possible Future Cooperative Activities

Although we can speak only for the three countries represented at this conference it is hoped that other English speaking countries will cooperate in the activities described here.

1) Description of good current programmes: Even without research and development of the kind suggested later there is no doubt that there would be considerable advantage in discovering good programmes and practices in which teachers are already engaged. A description of these, together with information about new resources, would be of value to teachers of English everywhere.

2) Research and Development:

a) Some researches and projects in curriculum development of common interest to several countries should be planned by small joint teams and the research undertaken in more than one country at the same time. Apart from the advantage which might be derived from cooperation of this kind in training researchers in English, the projects themselves would produce more valuable results. Some projects which cannot be planned jointly may still offer opportunities for collaboration.

b) The following projects have already been suggested. Working Parties and Study Groups are requested to make known some of the more important and current researches they would like to see commissioned.

i) Researches on the teaching of literature and a longitudinal study of children's response to literature.

ii) The place of creative work in speech and drama, and in writing in relation to the central experiences of the English class.

iii) The use of new media in the teaching of English and in providing aesthetic experience.

iv) Aspects of teacher training, particularly the familiarization of teachers with the potentialities of the new resources for learning.

v) Continuity of the English programme.

vi) Speech education, with and without explicit teacher intervention.

vii) Teaching language for proficiency and as a humanistic discipline.

3) a) An international journal for teachers of English to be concerned with aspects of the teaching of the subject is proposed. In the first instance this might be thought of as a "Yearbook of Studies and Exchanges on the Teaching of English," but it is hoped that it would be possible to produce it more frequently. Such a journal would serve as a forum for exchanging ideas on all aspects of English teaching. It could provide an opportunity for the appearance of some of the items sugge sted below.

b) There may be an advantage in enlarging the reprinting, in the journals appearing in one country, pertinent articles published

originally in another country. The article exchange agreement could be worked out with the editor.

4) Exchange of Information

a) We lack a sufficient understanding of each other's systems of education simply in terms of the organization of English within the school programmes. There would be an advantage in preparing comparative reports which could be undertaken by visitors, such as exchange teachers or experienced teachers attending courses of study in countries other than their own. Or such studies might be commissioned individually such as that produced by G. C. Allen on U.S. Curriculum Development Center. What is required is a picture of the organization of the subject in different kinds of schools and an identification of the factors which influence or determine the organizations.

b) A general exchange of information about current and recently completed research and development is required. Such an exchange might be limited at the beginning to lists of projects with information about the source of any further information required. Short abstracts and descriptions would also be useful. Such lists and abstracts could very well appear annually in the proposed international journal.

c) We do not know enough about published materials, programmes, and books on the teaching of English published in countries other than our own. The same is true of our information about textbooks for

teaching English. Review papers concerned with these different types of materials, and referring to different aspects of English, for instance language and literature, could be prepared by a selected team of teachers or in the way proposed in (a) above. These papers could be published in the journal.

5) There are in operation schemes for the exchange of teachers at all levels of school and college, but it is felt that a strong case can be made for a scheme concerned especially with teachers of English, including members of university facilities. Such exchange visits should be arranged for lengths varying from three months to a complete school or college year.

6) It is not unlikely that international conferences on the teaching of English will become more frequent in the future, and this is desirable. Such a conference was proposed at Boston and has been arranged for Vancouver in August 1967, when classroom teachers from Canada and the U.S. will undoubtedly form the bulk of the members, though some participants will come from the U.K. and other English speaking countries. Some machinery to ensure continuity between various conferences, to plan them, is thought desirable. Similarly the planning is suggested of study tours by teams of teachers from our various countries, when advantage could be taken to discuss common problems at informal conferences and small group meetings with the teachers of the host country.

7) To ensure that some attempt is made to carry through these recommendations, a small committee is suggested which should consist of two or three representatives from each of the three countries (for the present). In the

United States these representatives would be responsible to the NCTE and MLA. In Canada it could very well be that the Canada Education Association and the proposed Canada Council of Teachers of English could cooperate. In Britain there should be cooperation between Schools Council, NATE, and the Linguistics Association.

Examinations and Grading

The English teacher works in a social and educational setting which has created and perpetuated examinations, tests, procedures for grading and assessment of every kind which disregard any reasonable conception for the aims of English and indeed promote rival values and kinds of work; the influence upon school curricula of these examinations and tests is increasing, and is aggravated by the effects of "grouping" or "streaming" about which the seminar has already expressed its concern.

The influence upon curricula and actual teaching of external examinations in English is particularly marked. In the opinion of the seminar a review of examinations and grading of all kinds should be undertaken forthwith.

This review should take into account the different purposes for which the examinations are designed and administered, and for which grades are given: satisfying employers accrediting, inter-school grouping, intra-school grouping, admission to college and university, the creating of profiles for teachers' information, diagnosing learning problems, measuring pupil progress, and evaluating different methods of curricula.

Such questions as the following might be asked in a context of English:

i What are the purposes to which examinations and gradings lend themselves?

ii Do the examinations serve these purposes efficiently?

iii Are any of these purposes educationally undesirable?

iv What particular problems arise in connection with external examinations, and how should they be dealt with?

v. Would alternative measures of assessment or perhaps an entirely different approach to the whole problem be appropriate?

vi Does the present system and grading lessen the sense of independence and responsibility with which teachers approach problems of assessing their own pupils' progress, diagnosing difficulty, etc.?

We recommend that NCTE, NATE, and MLA sponsor such a review.